

Gc-2019-3-manuscript-Decision

The abstract and the first part of the paper has benefited of the suggestions of the reviewers and it is now well organized. All the redundancies have been eliminated, and it is easy for the reader to understand and get to the point.

Nevertheless, to make the most of this work, I ask authors for one last effort that will make this work immediately usable by the reader interested.

The second part concerning the research performed (from 4.0) needs still to be organised according what suggested by the referees. The reader get lost in all the information provided risking losing the overview. In particular **Referee1** suggested to insert some graphics to facilitate the comprehension of the results by the readers. Although, the authors argument that “Presenting the results in one graphic is likely to be too confusing to a reader, and choosing only one result to prioritise over others is likely to either over simplify the results or falsely present some results as more important than others”

- 1- I insist on suggesting to find a way (a table or a couple of table maybe (methodology and results?)) to summarize, for instance, all the actors interviewed (kind and numbers) any other important element that can allow the reader to catch at a glance the kernel of your research. Especially the Community level survey requires such a summary (both for the methodology and for the results) ... We should imagine all the different types of readers: there is the reader that is almost new to the topic, and there is the reader that is involved as the authors in

the topic and for instance doesn't need to read carefully the part concerning the literature review, and want to go immediately to the point of your research. A summary will be the best way to introduce this reader into your work.

2) To go with **Referee2**, we cannot ignore his observations about the research methodology. In particular, I suggest to better contextualize all the data collected by writing a couple of words about the 2016/2017 monsoons. Was it routine or was a particular disruptive period.? Floods? How many dead if any? Please, add any other element that you believe could be relevant and make the reader better understanding how you conducted the survey.

Please correct line 356/7

“questions remains about the extent to which it would be appropriate” in

“Questions remain on to which extent it would be appropriate”

same at 1003