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 3 Comments

	REVIEWER 3 COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Point 1:	Line(s) 15-17 Divide into two sentences: " . . . urban development. A further identification . . ."	The sentence has been divided.
Point 2:	Line(s) 42-44 This sentence doesn't make sense to me. Please revisit the grammatical structure.	The sentence has been restructured.
Point 3:	Line 49 change "concern" to "pertain to"	The words have been replaced.
Point 4:	Line(s) 49-50 "an increase in" . . . "associated with"	The words have been replaced.
Point 5:	Line(s) 71-72 Explain to the reader what is meant by "social agreement". Or use a different term. Do you mean "community consensus"?	The term has been replaced by community consensus.
Point 6:	Figure 1 Change all 'NbS' to 'NBS' for consistency.	Figure updated.
Point 7:	Fig 1 / Table 1 The term "water security" is quite broad and encompasses many of the other terms. Can you define it a little more closely, e.g., freshwater withdrawals, etc.	Changed to freshwater withdrawals. The table has been complemented with the cases code and references. And the figure has been deleted to avoid reiteration. In addition, detailed information is presented in Appendix A table A2.
Point 8:	Figure 3 appears twice in my text	References numbering corrected.
Point 9:	Line 206 Define "phytorid" for the reader.	Lines 214-215. Definition included.
Point 10:	Figure 5 Why "permeable pavement" and "phytorid" not in regulation ES? This Figure may not really be needed if Figure 4 is complete enough.	The figure has been deleted. Line 256. Information presented in figure 4.
Point 11:	Figure 5 If retained state the source: G.M.-G?	The figure has been deleted.
Point 12:	Line 283 This should reference "Table 4" I think.	References numbering corrected.
Point 13:	Line 291 This should be Table 4.	References numbering corrected.
Point 14:	Line 381 "Conclusions" section is well-written.	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.