

Review on the article "Insurance engagement in flood risk reduction – examples from household and business insurance in developed countries" by Isabel Seifert-Dähnn

The manuscript now improved a lot. The manuscript now synthesizes the potential measures for flood risk reduction that insurers can take. In comparison to the first version, the title, the research question, the method description and the conclusions are now streamlined. Thus, I do not see any relevant issues that prevent the publication of the manuscript. I have solely a few minor remarks:

- the author is writing in plural (we analysed, our analysis). It might be better to add the co-author or to change this and to write about herself (I analyzed). → I corrected this, sorry, I am not used to write papers alone.

-Table 1: The definition of "all hazards" is vague. In some countries landslides or earthquakes are not included while for example floods, snow avalanches and rockfall processes are included. Please specify the types of processes considered (to be preferred) or write about "multiple hazards" instead of "all hazards" (not preferable). → The table got very crowded when I added the type of hazards and in addition I considered the information on the types of hazard of less relevant for the content of the paper. So I decided to change the wording in the table from "all hazards" to "multiple hazards".

-there are a number of typos → I revised the whole document again, so I hope I found all of them

-page 9, line 30: you are writing how you adapted the figure but not why. → I added some explanations why I adapted the figure

-page 12, line 30: data protection issues --> data privacy issues → I corrected this

-you mention "building codes" in chapter 4.1.2 and "property level measures" in 4.1.3. These terms both are the same matter. In my view, the building code regulates whether object protection is needed or not and thus, both are related. Please specify the division of both in detail or merge them into one chapter. → In my opinion, it is not completely the same, even though there is a large overlap concerning all measures which require changing the structure of the building. But measures like avoiding having high-value non-waterproof assets in flood-prone parts of a house, store chemicals in the upper parts, move valuable items in case of an emerging flood i.e. all non-structural measures are not covered by building codes. In addition, apply building codes only to new buildings and not to the existing stock.

-in page 19, line 30-35 you mentioned the potential of deductibles as incentives. However, the discussion section does not mention this very important point (may somewhere at line 15, page 28). → I took that up in more detail in the discussions-part.

- the conclusion section needs a grammar revision and a thorough check for typos. → I had an English native speaker (American) revising this chapter again

-page 29, line 7: Financial aid for both, property-level protection measures and for large-scale protection infrastructure in form of subsidies and grants was found under public as well as in private insurance schemes. → I changed the wording according to your

suggestion, the complete paragraph reads now like this: Financial aid for both, property-level protection measures and for large-scale protection infrastructure in form of subsidies and grants was found under public as well as in private insurance schemes. But direct co-investment of insurers in large-scale protection infrastructure only happened in Switzerland. However, for most programs an evaluation of their "success" i.e. the uptake rates or total sums of financial aid used is missing.

-maybe the most critical point to consider is that you often mentioned the high amount of transaction costs of implementing flood risk reduction strategies. However, I do not have seen the proof of this statement. Please add references regarding the transaction costs or soften this statement. → I softened this statement a bit as I could not find literature on it related to hazard insurance,