Greetings, initially I would like to thank the referee for appreciating the work and bringing so many constructive contributions to the manuscript. Thank you very much, I will make all the proposed corrections.

Some points raised by the referee need clarification from the authors, they are these:

- All the suggestions proposed by the referee are possible to be carried out, some had already been observed by us authors and we were working on them, such as the need to adapt the maps and/or index nomenclature to better adjust to the English language. Therefore, we find it unnecessary or with disproportionate rigor the prior non-acceptance of the manuscript, which was proposed by the referee.

- The research has a pragmatic character, bringing the knowledge built in the academy to the practical reality of the management of water resources in a Brazilian state. This bias permeates the entire research, however, we understand that it is not the main or only contribution. Therefore, we will adjust the text to make this pragmatic perspective clear, but also bringing the relevance of the research in terms of the scientific contributions it has brought, mainly theoretical and methodological.

- The research work has the function of bringing an innovative methodological proposal, so there are no parameters of other works available that can bring the assessment of disaster risk on a local/regional scale, through an index, with 19 variables, therefore robust. Any criticism in the sense that we should have brought parameters from other works or something similar would be a task that would not fit. Even the works found that resemble the theme of the manuscript were cited.

- The work is a product of a doctoral thesis, which had a very extensive and detailed analysis. So, summarizing it in a manuscript with approximately 20 pages is a very complicated task, in this way, the referee's proposals for corrections are very necessary and pertinent. Therefore, we are working on the text of the manuscript, in order to remove redundancies, expand the discussion and make the methodology clearer/direct, show the relevance of the research for the academy in its methodological proposal and general analysis, in addition to expanding the discussion to the international audience.
The manuscript has, by nature, a regional scale of analysis, it is a Brazilian state with an area of 52,797 km². In addition, the perspective of risk studies on a detailed scale permeated the work, so there was an effort to bring information inherent to the regional reality, with its problems detailed in their causes and solutions proposed by the research. In this context, the importance of research is to bring this detail which can be used by the academy for comparisons with other places in the world, for example. Therefore, we disagree with the referee when he says that: "There is a lot of local information that is not of interest to international scientific readers". The theme of risk in Geography focuses on broad socio-environmental dangers, on a global scale, such as climate change, earthquakes, famine, drought, but there is also a need to study the place and how its problems relate to a global perspective, it is the what is called the "game of scales", or even, as Milton Santos said: "places become particular manifestations of the world-totality (...) thinking globally and acting locally. Perhaps this relationship was not clear in the manuscript, but we will be careful to clarify it when we present the corrected manuscript, we are already working on it.

Again, your contributions were fundamental for the evolution of the research and improvement of the text, thank you very much!