

Reviewer 2 comment	Author response	(Proposed) Changes manuscript
In the introduction section, community resilience and its role as a social support mechanism should be given more emphasis as this is the very critical topic of the study.	Thank you for this comment. We will add a short description of community resilience to the introduction.	Add short description of community resilience to the introduction
p.5, lines 110-112: protective role of social support on mental health is not an assumption - it has been validated by many research findings. This sentence should be revised so that it does not frame this role as an assumption.	Agreed! We will drop "assumption" from the sentence (rephrase the sentence).	Rephrase the sentence
Use of "provide support" or "support" where the word "corroborated" is used throughout the manuscript - a suggestion.	Thank you for this comment. We will conduct a language edit (native speaker) to resolve any language issues.	Perform language edit
p.8, lines 189-190: The rationale for expecting "the buffering effect of social support to be more pronounced when applying measures of collective (vs. interpersonal) social support." needs to be more clearly explained.	Thank you for this comment. As natural hazards usually are collective challenges, we reasoned that collective-level variables might be better predictors of mental health outcomes than individual-level variables. Similarly, previous research on global environmental problems has found that collective efficacy was a better predictor than personal self-efficacy for pro-environmental action. However, as this assumption (i.e. relative predictive power of individual vs. collective-level variables) is not central for our research, we decided to drop this sentence.	Drop sentence from manuscript.
The study is based on a specific case study (flooding in Bavaria, 2016), but the case study context is not explained. Sociodemographic and cultural characteristics as well as disaster risk and governance information should be given briefly so that readers know the case site better to make sense of the findings.	Thank you for raising this point! We will add a more detailed description of the study region.	Add more detailed description of the study region.
Data was collected in two mediums: paper-pencil and online - N for each should be	Thank you for this comment. We will provide separate Ns for the offline and online	Provide separate Ns for online and

<p>given. Also, did the researchers check whether there were significant differences in main study variables between these two groups? If not, this should also be indicated as a rationale for analyzing the two data sets together.</p>	<p>questionnaires. We also controlled for differences regarding survey method but found no significant effects.</p>	<p>paper-&-pencil surveys</p>
<p>Method section could be revised and rearranged to include each variable (or set of variables) as separate subtopics and give more detailed information under each. In the current version of method, it can be hard to read and follow the variables and how they were assessed. It would also be nice to have each measure in the appendix - it is important to make sense of the results.</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. We would like to keep the method section as streamlined as possible. However, we could present a table to summarize the core measures of the study and to provide a more comprehensive overview of our scales. We will also provide a full list of measures/items in an appendix.</p>	<p>Provide a full list of measures/items in an appendix</p>
<p>Did the researchers analyze the correlations between main study variables and disaster-related sociodemographic variables (property ownership and previous flood experience)? Were there any significant correlations? If so, this should be indicated and the analyses should be repeated to see if the results change or not, and reported accordingly.</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. We analysed the correlations between sociodemographic variables (property ownership and previous flood experience) and core variables (perceived consequences, collective social support, interpersonal social support, post-disaster mental health). Results showed no significant correlations (one exception: respondents with previous flood experience reported lower levels of interpersonal social support; $r = .32$). However, including previous flood experience as a covariate in our main analyses did not change the significance of our results.</p>	<p>No action</p>
<p>Community resilience items seem to reflect a description of community characteristics - they do not reflect whether respondents consider and/or use these characteristics as a means of collective social support themselves. Thus, there seems to be an assumption here. The researchers should explain this in the method section and also discuss its possible influence on the findings.</p>	<p>Thank you for raising this point! The CART measure was developed by Pfefferbaum et al. specifically to measure community resilience and has been applied by subsequent research across different hazard contexts. The measure distinguishes between different dimensions of community resilience such as connecting and caring (e.g. "People in my community help each other"; "People in my community are committed to the well-being of the community"), resources (e.g. "My community has the resources it needs to take care of community problems"),</p>	<p>Add notes to the method section and the General Discussion to address this issue</p>

	<p>transformative potential (e.g. "People in my community work together on solutions so that the community can improve.") or disaster management (e.g. "My community actively prepares for future disasters."). From our perspective, especially the CART items on connecting and caring are similar to items used in other measures of social support. We therefore argue that CART goes beyond a mere description of the community but captures the potential of the community to provide social support. Nevertheless, we concede that for some of the items the reference to social support might be less pronounced and that the CART measure <u>might</u> be a somewhat indirect measure of collective-level social support. However, even if this limitation is valid, it should weaken the effects, due to restricted correspondence between independent and dependent measures. Thus, our results would probably underestimate the buffering effect of community resilience on mental health. We agree with your suggestion to add notes to the method section and the General Discussion to address this issue.</p>	
<p>More information about the adaptation of CART scale into German should be given in the method section</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. The scale was translated from English to German (by German native speaker) and then back English (by English native speaker). Issues were resolved among the two translators. We will provide a full list of CART items used in the survey in an appendix.</p>	<p>Provide a full list of measures/items in an appendix</p>
<p>The rationale for selecting the particular items from the original scales should be given for each variable.</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment. To fit the requirements of a field study in a very sensitive situation (surveying people only few weeks after flooding), we had to discuss our draft questionnaire with local representatives and persons helping us to disseminate the questionnaire (e.g. representatives from emergency organizations). The final item selection was based on these discussions. We will add a note on this to the method section.</p>	<p>Add note to method section</p>

<p>I suggest the readers to refer to findings of the emBRACE project where community resilience was the main study topic, in different disaster contexts and from different theoretical and methodological perspectives.</p> <p>* Overall output of the project; the community disaster resilience framework (book):https://www.wiley.com/engf/Framing+Community+Disaster+Resilience-p-9781119165965</p> <p>* Particular case study finding on perceptions of community resilience in earthquake context (article): https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420915301849</p> <p>* Particular case study finding on psychological resilience in earthquake context (article): https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15325024.2015.1108794</p>	<p>Thank you for this helpful references! We will incorporate them into our theory section.</p>	<p>Update theory section</p>
<p>Technical corrections and typos</p>		
<p>use of "&" between authors of end-text references with 2 or 3 authors (not "and")</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments / careful reading of our manuscript</p>	<p>We will correct these errors /</p>
<p>use of "," after "e.g." – that is, "e.g., word"</p>		<p>conduct a language edit</p>
<p>use of apostrophes with Times New Roman font (there are ones who are no written with this font)</p>		
<p>Use of comma before "and" for cases like "aaa, bbb, and ccc" (when there are three or more factors listed)</p>		
<p>Statistical values in the Results section should be checked as some of them are different from the values indicated in the tables.</p>		
<p>p. 2, line 25: "might have" (HAVE instead of HAS)</p>		
<p>p.3, line 42: "people's health" apostrophe is not written with the font Times New Roman.</p>		
<p>p.3, line 42: "people's" (apostrophe should be used before the letter s)</p>		
<p>p.3, line 50: "exposure" can be preferred instead of</p>		

"exposition"		
p.3, line 42: "e.g., social support" (comma after the letter g.)		
p.4, line 61: parenthesis before "Pfefferbaum" should be deleted.		
p. 4, lines 64-71: Presentation of the article structure seems to be too mechanically written. This can be distracting for the research aim mentioned just before. It would be better to elaborate on the research aim, specifying the variables of interest - instead of giving the article structure (article structure is as expected, no need to mention that!). Still, if deemed necessary, at the end of this paragraph a short sentence outlining the introduction subtopics can be used.		We will rephrase this paragraph to incorporate central variables / analyses
p.4, line 73: "flooding losses (both financial and non-financial)" (place of parenthesis information can be changed as indicated)		We will correct these errors
p.4, line 76: " pain), and " (comma after parenthesis)		
p.4, line 78: "negatively affected" (adverb before the verb)		
p.4, line 78: "well-being" (not wellbeing)		
p.4, line 81: "Stein et al., " (space after "et")		
p.4, lines 82-84: (e.g.,... [references]; for a review, see Ohl & Tapsell, 2000)		
p.4, line 86: "(, 2016)." (dot after the parenthesis)		
p.5, lines 87-88: the first sentence of a paragraph should not start with "although". It can be revised not to include "although" in the beginning.		We will rephrase this
p.5, lines 94-96: no need to give definition of ego-resilience with direct quotation, paraphrasing would be enough and also better.		We would like to keep this

p.5, line 99: "relocation need" (instead of "the need to relocation")		We will rephrase this
p.5, line 101: "...; Mason et al., 2010)." (dot after the parenthesis)		We will correct these errors
p.5., line 103: no need for parenthesis before "Dittrich"		
p.5., lines 107-109: (e.g., aaa, bbb, ccc, and ddd; author1 & author 2, year). – this is a more accurate way of giving examples with references at the end. I will not specifically write this correction in the following cases.		We would like to keep it separately to clarify which references are linked to specific findings
p.6, line 119: "do not" (instead of cannot)		We will correct these errors
p.6., line 135: "In flood context, empirical evidence for " (omission of the's)		
p.7, line 147: "They first provided "		
p.7, line 161: ", these findings need further replications to reach firm conclusions."		
p.7, line 162: "Taken together" (instead of "In sum")		
p.8, line 182: "but also to society" (adding "also")		
p.8, line 187: "Resilience communities are described as being able to "... " (...)." "		
p.8, line 191: "To further explore the topic, the present research : : : " (instead of "more exploratory")		
p.8, line 191-192: It would be better to revise this sentence to more clearly indicate what it is meant to say so that hypotheses 6 & 7 can be better understood.		We will rephrase the sentence
p.9, lines 195-196: No need to start a new paragraph for "Extending this work..." – two sentences should be in the same paragraph.		We will restructure the text
p.9, line 198: "contribute" instead of "complement"		We will correct these errors
p.9, lines 201-202: suggestion "Particularly, our		

research focuses on the following hypotheses:"		
p.9, lines 214-215: "consequences of flooding"		
p.10, line 224: "consists of" (instead of "contains")		
p.10, line 224: "aged between 18 and 80"		
p.10, line 243: "e.g., ..." instead of "example item" (same suggestion in other cases where this phrase is used in the method section)		We will rephrase it
p.10, lines 261-263: Why egoresilience was used as a covariate? The rationale needs to be clearly stated.	We used it as a covariate as it reflects people's capacity to deal with stress in an adaptive manner, thus affecting post-disaster mental health (over and above social support). We will add the last point to the description of the measure.	Extend description of measure
p.12, line 296: "psychological and physical distress" ("and" instead of "&")		We will correct these errors
p.12, line 298: "distress and sense of coherence" ("and" instead of "&")		
p.13, line 319: ".. explained 35% of the variance ..."		
p.17, line 427-428: "... for improving our understanding of ..."		
p.18, line 456: semicolon should be used between references		
p.18, line 459: "social and social life" - there seems to be sth wrong here		
p.19, line 470-474: CART-related sentences seem to be very similar with those in the method section. There is need for paraphrasing here.		We will rephrase it