

In our response below, we will use *Rn.m* to indicate the referee comment and *An.m* to indicate the authors' reply, where n is the referee number and m the comment number. Line numbers in the authors' response refer to the manuscript file *without* track changes. In the manuscript file *with* track-changes, added text is in [blue](#), deleted text is in [pink](#), and moved text is in [green](#).

Referee 1

*R1.1: Dear authors,
thank you very much for your revised version. It reads very well, but I have a main comments: I'm still not 100% sure if your conceptual framework is the best suit once: I would rather recommend not to talk too much in detail about the use of socio-hydrology modelling as you aren't really providing information about how to improve the modelling work of socio-hydrology; I would rather suggest to focus your theoretical framework – which also has a stronger influence to your discussion/conclusion part – more on the current psychological debates on risk awareness / risk perception; meaning the different theoretical schools, such as PMT, SARF etc. and how your paper (in the discussion) are actually contributing to the current psychological schools.*

A1.1 We again thank the Referee for taking the time to review our manuscript and for providing additional comments that helped us improve our work. We have now worked on balancing our manuscript in the concluding section (lines 560–577), reserving more space for our theoretical contribution and removing the part concerning socio-hydrological modelling, as suggested. We also included limitations in the conclusions and added some directions for future studies.