

Dear authors,

it was a great pleasure to review your paper. It's well written and includes very important information, not only for the academic research community but also for policy makers; in particular, for the national flood risk management authorities, such as EA/DEFRA and many more. The paper covers an important topic. However, I have four small comments, which I would like to express below:

1) First, I would like to ask you to include a broader discussion to the term social vulnerability in the first part of the paper. I would add a broader literature review on the term social vulnerability (roots, schools, limitation of each discussion), so you can frame both terms. Besides your literature I also would suggest following papers to add in your paper: Birkmann, J. and T. Welle. (2015): Assessing the risk of loss and damage: exposure, vulnerability and risk to climate-related hazards for different country classifications; *International Journal of Global Warming*; Birkmann, J.; Cardona, O.D; Carreno; L.; Barbat, A.; Pelling, M.; Schneiderbauer, S.; Kienberger, S., Kelier, M.; Alexander, D.; Zeil, P. Welle, T. (2013): Framing vulnerability, risk and societal responses: the MOVE framework. *Natural Hazards*, 67(2): 193-211; Birkmann, Jörn (2006): Measuring Vulnerability to Promote Disaster-Resilient Societies: Conceptual Frameworks and Definitions, in: Birkmann, Jörn (Eds.): *Measuring Vulnerability to Natural Hazards - Towards Disaster Resilient Societies*, Tokyo, New York, Paris; United Nations University Press: 9-54; Fuchs, S.; Kuhlicke, C. & V. Meyer (2011): Vulnerability to natural hazards – the challenge of integration. *Natural Hazards* 58 (2). p. 609-619; Fuchs, S. (2009): Susceptibility versus resilience to mountain hazards in Austria – Paradigms of vulnerability revisited. *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences* 9 (2). p. 337-352; Hufschmidt (2011): A comparative analysis of several vulnerability concepts. *Natural Hazards* 58 (2). P. 621-643; Kuhlicke et al. (2011): A comparative analysis of several vulnerability concepts. *Natural Hazards* 58 (2). P. 789-810. Wisner et al. (2004) *At risk: natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters*.

2.) Please, provide a more critical reflection (in generally) on the use of social vulnerability indicators; what are the methodological limitations?

3) In your paper you selected a very special region. In particular, the community of Bridgwater shows a high socially problem within the country – please add some more paragraphs about the area (maybe this paper helps: Thaler & Levin-Keitel (2016): Multi-level stakeholder engagement in flood risk management – A question of roles and power: Lessons from England. In: *Environmental Science & Policy*. 55 (2): 292-301)

4) Last point: what is missing in the paper: the impact of your results/studies for the policy makers. What does your paper mean for the actual flood risk management policy in England? What does this mean for the actual localism/public-private debate in flood risk management in England (see Thaler

& Levin-Keitel (2016): Multi-level stakeholder engagement in flood risk management – A question of roles and power: Lessons from England. In: *Environmental Science & Policy*. 55 (2): 292-301 and Thaler & Priest (2014) Partnership funding in flood risk management: new localism debate and policy in England. *Area* 46 (4): 418-425). For the national authorities who are dealing with flood risk management also outside of the UK, such as US Army Corps.