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I am very grateful to reviewer Dr. Pat Gober for her very positive comments. This review comment has been especially useful in clarifying the role of this paper in bridging between "backward looking" socio-hydrologic modeling and "forward looking" policy making.

As I see it there are currently two schools of thought on what socio-hydrology entails
1) One group of scholars (Kandasamy et al., di Baldasarre et al.) feel we can study long-term trajectories as objective observers, model bi-directional feedbacks and then make predictions on socio-hydrologic systems could evolve. The tools of this group are simulation models (for biophysical, infrastructure, trade feedbacks) and agent-based models (for human/agency behavior).

2) The other group (Lane, Gober and Wheater) feel socio-hydrology is about adaptive management. In this school socio-hydrologic modellers embed themselves in the communities and engage all actors to understand the implications of different "framings" of the problem. They have an open dialogue about parameters and assumptions. The tools used include shared vision planning, cooperative modeling, serious gaming etc.

The reviewer has provided me with a series of very useful citations which could help bridge the gap between the "two schools of socio-hydrology" at least partially. I think that incorporating these ideas in the framing of the paper will improve it substantially.

However, I am not confident that I can claim to address "legitimacy issues" in this work. The study did not explicitly involve stakeholder interactions although it was certainly done keeping in mind a "problem driven approach" and involved dozens of informal interviews. So I will have to be careful in not making my claims too far reaching here.