The authors are thanked for the revision which resulted in a better readability. But there are remaining issues below.

Editor's previous comment:

L341 (L341-346), 356(360-361), 373(376-378), e.g., L474(476-478): "increases by 5%-10% during 2008-2018" - state what this is relative to. These seem to be referring to trends over the period. Are the quoted values per year? Also L479-481(480-481) and make this clear elsewhere. Are these increases statistically significant? Have the authors conducted statistical significance test? Please state this clearly in the manuscript.

Author's response:

All these increases are the value in 2016 as comparing to the value of year 2008 (baseline). Authors have not conducted statistical test, since the results are ONLY for showing development tendency. Statistical test (e.g. T-test) requires certain numbers of observations. For example, we could do a t-test for the means for the first four years and the next five years (the change is in 2012). However, we have only nine observations!

Editor's response: Thank you for clarifying that these are based on 2016 relative to 2008. Differences between two points could be just due to random fluctuations, not a long-term tendency. It could be inferred visually, but the tendency itself (e.g., linear trend) can have a statistical significance calculated. If those linear trends shown in the figures are statistically significant, then the change in 2016 from 2008 would be significant as well, thus it would indicate a real signal such as climate change.

Suggested method. The statistical significance of the slope of a best-fit line can be evaluated using the t-distribution. The statistic value for a linear regression model y=Beta1*x+Beta0 is: t=(Beta1 – Beta10)/standard error, where Beta1 is the slope of the fitted line, Beta0 is the y-axis transect, and Beta10 can be set as 0 (i.e., testing against null hypothesis of no trend) and the standard error is: standard deviation of y / sqrt(sum(x-mean(x))^2). The rejection region for say 0.05 level would be t > t(alpha,n-2) where n is the number of sample (in this case 9). This can be found in standard statistics text books (e.g., Devore J. L., Probability and Statistics for Engineering and the Sciences, p. 498).

Now it may be challenging to indicate this in every line of the figures, so the authors may just comment in the main text on a few selected cases. It would be much better though if the statistical significance can be shown in each of the figures by e.g., showing those time series with statistically insignificant slope in thinner lines. I strongly encourage the authors to implement this as it would significantly increase the impact of this paper.

Please incorporate these edits to L391-397: Although adaptive capacity in all 16 districts is increasing, ~~but~~ the increase is not enough to overcome the increase in both sensibility and exposure. The integrated UVI in the case ~~of~~ of drought is almost stabilized, due to that fact that this UVI decreases in the urban core areas and increases in the urban outskirt of ecological conservation areas. The integrated UVI in the case ~~of~~ of floods increases slowly, due to the fact that the -increase of both sensibility and exposure increases the UVI and the improvement of urban drainage services and governance capacity decreases the UVI.