Dear reviewer,

We highly appreciate your comments, it has been a fruitful experience to go throughout your suggestions and the manuscript has introduced the major changes expected. Specifically, the introduction has been rewritten, the results are presented in more detail and an Appendix A has been developed to complement the review. The changes in the manuscript can be tracked, however, minor of formal changes have been accepted to facilitate your review. We have improved the figures and tables presented and we deleted two figures to avoid reiteration. In general terms, we recognize the limitation of our review due to the use of European keywords, but, we have made an effort to provide insightful information within these concepts of 'NBS' and 'peri-urban' to present our study as a review of implementation experiences. Please find in the next pages the answers to your valuable inputs.

Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

	REVIEWER 2 COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Point 1:	Please check all tables and figures numbering. There are some errors, e.g. two different figures 1, two different tables 3, figure 3 is doubled, etc..	References numbering corrected.
Point 2:	I suggest the authors to use one standardised framework for ES analysis, such as the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services Version 4.3, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment or TEEB classification - I am not convinced of the classification used by the authors and I think some errors are present. For example, only three class are present, while most of the classifications use 4 classes including SUPPORTING services https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecosystem_service - https://www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.300.aspx.pdf ; "Natural Habitat/shelter" ecosystem service is not a provisioning service, but a SUPPORT/REGULATING service: http://www.fao.org/ecosystem-services-biodiversity/background/supporting-services/en/.	We followed the structure proposed by the Common International Classification of Ecosystem Services Version 5.1 which "avoids the use of the terms 'intermediate' and 'supporting services' entirely", which we consider appropriate for ES related to water (Guidance-V51-01012018.pdf)
Point 3:	Conclusions are not informative. A clear "takeaway message" is not present (which are the main barriers? which the main lesson learnt?) and nothing is mentioned about the geographical imbalance of studies (a lot in Europe, few in Africa and South America). Authors should state also clearly which are the research gaps identified by their review.	Lines 412-421. Conclusions have been complemented with overall lesson learnt and barrier. Lines 429-431. Recognition on the European focus has been introduced. In addition, it is mentioned along the text. Lines 431-433. Recognition on how to complement this analysis is presented. Lines 433-437. Research gaps and opportunities are presented.
Point 4:	Line 20: I think it should be "water management peri-urban" **areas**.	Complemented as Peri-urban areas.
Point 5:	25: No need to insert keywords which are present in the title	Keywords have been changed for: NBS; sustainable water management; ecosystem services; problem-solution, governance.
Point 6:	75: same comment of line 20 ("water management peri-urban" **areas)**	Complemented as Peri-urban areas.
Point 7:	94: there is an error with a reference source that is missing. Please check this and the other occurrences of "**Error! Reference source not found**"	References numbering corrected.
Point 8:	118: since only 35 references were analysed, I suggest to include a table of all references. The table should include the specific water challenges, ecosystem services, type, scale, policy and financial instruments and stakeholders considered in each paper. This will constitute a database very useful for	Appendix A has been included. Table A1 presents the list of included references with location. Table A2 challenges and descriptions. Table A3 ES and descriptions. A4 Summary of types,

	the reader, to be used in conjunction with the graphs. The table can be in an appendix.	challenges and ES. A5. Summary of types and scales with descriptions. In addition, to specify each aspect in the cases, the figures and tables along the text have been complemented with the codes for each implementation experience.
Point 9:	139-143: these lines can be shortened and/or moved to the introduction	Sentences moved to the introduction. In addition the introduction has been restructured.
Point 10:	Table 1: Why does socio-cultural services are a water challenge?	Lines 168-175. Explanation included. Since the challenges included are directly related to water, but could relate to other aspects, we have delete the 'water' term to present all the challenges found in the literature. In addition, the information is complemented with cases descriptions in Appendix 1 Table A2.
Point 11:	Figure 4: to me is useless, since it is not clear which ES is linked to which water challenge.	Figure updated, presenting each case linked to type, water challenges and ES.
Point 12:	Figure 5: when seeing a circular graph like this, I assume that all the items present along the circle are of the same type, e.g. geographical areas: https://gjabel.wordpress.com/2014/03/28/circular-migration-flow-plots-in-r/. Here ES and NBS types are mixed, and I suggest something similar, showing different type of items in different ways:	Line 256. Information presented in figure 4. The figure has been deleted to avoid reiteration.
Point 13:	However, I think authors could even think of a more informative graph also including information at lines 240-242. Indeed, it will be interesting to see which NBS are built to provide which service, but with reference to a specific zone.	Line 256. Information presented in figure 4. The aspect related to zones was not included, since it added complexity, but didn´t represent differences.
Point 14:	Line 239: what does Source: (G.M.-G.) means? I think this artwork was made by authors.	The figure has been deleted.
Point 15:	Table 3 - line 266: I think authors can also include at which scale does the policy refer (global/regional/national/sub-national/municipal)	Line 286. Information included.
Point 16:	Line 397 - "Natwip paper, in progress" - an unpublished document cannot be cited. How editors/reviewers/readers could check it? and what if the paper, submitted, will be rejected for an error?	The reference has been deleted.