Reviewer 2 - Responses

I suggested to provide more quantitative evaluation of that exceptionality, that was achieved for the landslides example.

RE: Accepted by changes in the existing text and adding the new sentence as follows:
"The five landslides in 1817 in north-western Bohemia, which are not included in the historical catalogue of landslides by Špůrek (1972), are among the three most important landsliding events to appear in documentary evidence before 1900. Other recorded landslides documented in this area took place only in 1770 (14 landslides), as a result of the very wet and rainy year of 1769, and in winter 1769/1770 (see e.g. Raška et al., 2016) and in 1897–1900 (50 landslides altogether), due to persistent wet and rainy patterns (Rybář and Suchý, 2000). Apart from these three events, only 13 landslides in the remaining nine years during the 1770–1900 period are documented; this distribution also reflects the number of documentary sources available for extraction (Raška, 2016)."

However, in relation to the Floods in River Elbe you state that there is river flow data in Litomerice since 1851. If that is the case then you have 165 years of data, more than enough to compute the long-term return period of exceptional floods. Surely it is possible to classify the extreme event described in the sentence associated with that episode (?)

RE: Accepted by adding corresponding sentence estimating N-year return period to water level reported as follows:
"A message from Litoměřice dated 9 August reports a flood lasting eight days on the River Elbe after five weeks of rainy periods. The water rose to a level of two feet [c. 65 cm] under the bridge, so the structure survived, but grain, vegetable and other field crops were damaged (Katzerowsky, 1895). The water level reported would correspond to a c. 20-year return period if this were compared with systematically measured water levels at Litoměřice between 1851 and 1969 (Brázdil et al., 2005a)."