Dear Editors,

The comments from the reviewers have different meanings and character, as an order and language notes (being easy to correct), to discussion of the results and comments to the structure of the text. I tried to find best solution for the paper trying to fit the comments into the text. In some places I listed comments with explanation why I have decided to leave the text unchanged. I tried to create good balance between requests to add few more theoretical approach and keeping the word limit. I also shortened some places of the text to be more clear in description (as not to exceed the 8000 word limit – without abstract and keywords it is now 8014 words). I refer all the comments below.

- **R#1.** The term „Pomerelia” is applied in the scientific literature on the background of German terminology which widespread to many European countries. Because of it I didn’t use the Polish term „Gdańsk Pomerania”. Word „Pomerelia” is taken from larger term Pomerania divided to west part “Pommern” and east part “Pomerellen” (in German and in Polish West and East Pomerania). The term „Gdańsk Pomerania” is also possible to use, but because of changes in political situation in the late-medieval period it wasn’t typical. I proposed the explanation of the term in brackets in abstract and on the third page in the text.

- **R#1.** I used the term „construction” to describe building techniques and building as a category, so I put changes in places in which will be clearer to use “building techniques”, but in few places I left word “construction”.

- **R#1.** pot tiles is clear (ie E. Roth-Heege and her dictionary). It is also necessary to underline pot tiles in comparison with bowl tiles. Because of it I decided to use more detailed description, not only term “vessel tiles”.

- **R#1.** I think that “pots” is also clear, but of course I don’t mind to use term “cooking pots” – only one place at the page 8 (lower paragraph).

- **R#1.** I use term heating system twice but only as a general term, and after description of the type of this construction

- **R#1.** I think that two pages of manuscript giving a sufficient background of the historical conditions and development of Pomerelian towns. After few publications connected with such problematic I decided to shorten this description giving also sufficient literature. Having in mind request to limit the total number of words it will be difficult to enlarge this part of the text.

**- R#1.** I changed the caption in table 1 **.**

- **R#2.** Abstract: Pomerelia – see above; I add the term “hinterland” to „outskirts” to be more clear and suggest hypothesis of the paper.

- **R#2.** Ch. Dyer is filled as a reference.

- **R#2.** Fig. 1 is improved; … Further suggestions and comments to bibliography are included into the text.

- **R#2.** Comment devoted to metal vessels is revised.

- **R#2.** I think that the comment devoted to the suburbs of major towns is not useful in the conclusions. In that part of the text I’m trying to compare material culture and level of life between major and minor towns in general. Distraction from them to suburbs don’t give us a significant result, especially if we look at garbage dumps with a lot of attractive finds but only on a secondary deposits. I put information in reference, that such perspective is important but should presented as a separate studies. But for me footnote (no5) is not necessary.

- **R#3 (and in some places R#4).** Ad.1. I emphasize private construction as a main aspect of description of the building techniques. Because of it I didn’t write about churches and fortifications. Those kinds of structures do not have simple connection with adaptation of building techniques on private plots. Such situation is similar in archaeological literature. I underlined also the same patterns in private architecture but different technical solutions (on the basis of economic conditions). In the text I noted that at the level of art and architecture, we have too little data for the analyzed small towns. This is another example of the distance to big-city architecture. When it comes to literature, I have included several items, I am aware of wider literature. However, I referred to specific arguments in the works cited.

- **R#3.** Ad.2. That’s true that the paper is based on new or last excavations in recent years. I changed information of it to be more clear in the introduction of the text.

- **R#3.** Ad.3. As above, I tried to underline rescue and wide-area investigations. Comparison with other small towns Is not necessary, because of secondary meaning for correct course of reasoning.

- **R#3.** Ad.4. Yes, This comment deserves another paper. I only pointed out the differences between archaeological and historical data, without any further studies.

- **R#3.** Ad.5. I’m not quite sure if I correctly understood term “visual sources”. If the reviewers asked me about maps, graphics or other pictures I must clearly describe that we don’t have any of those sources for all of the 18th towns. First maps are from the 17th ct. and graphic from the 18th ct.

- **R#3.** Ad.6. The comment is also revised in the text while keeping a distance from the identification of luxury

- **R#3.** Ad.7. Comment about R. Gilchrist has been entered into the text. However, I did not explain this theoretical issue more broadly, wanting to focus on issues directly related to the problem of the Baltic towns.

- **R#3.** Ad.8. Hanseatic League is changed to Hanse.

- **R#3.** Ad.9. I think that 18 towns are clearly visible on the map with Gdańsk as the 19th town – major centre.

- **R#3.** Ad.10. I changed some typos, and terms but if you will have some more suggestions I’m open to stylistic changes in the text.

- **R#4.** Most part of the comment was added as small changes in the mid-section of the text. I read this part carefully and I think that construction of that part of the text is clear (with introduction).

- There is a problem with identification of places of origin of new settlers because most analogies come from colonized in the 13th ct. area (so Prussia, Bohemia, Silesia). Because of it I emphasized that colonists came from Turingia and Saxonia and also from area of German colonisation. (A separate paper should be devoted to this identification including bioarchaeological data).

- The reviewer's remark regarding the archaeological similarities is absolutely correct. This aspect is already sufficiently equally emphasized in the conclusions that the archaeological data contrast with the written sources.

- I also changed some details in conclusions and structure of arguments. Studies on Hanseatic or German influence is now more pure, in connection with the delete of some Hanseatic threads. The problem of semi-peripheral or satellite stays in the same form. It is my decision. It is only an early conclusion need to be more precise but after next investigations. (maybe with further comparison with other small Baltic towns).

- The observations about the terminology are revised in the text (describing of decoration of glass beaker I also found term “threads”, but I think that “coiled prunts” in this case is better)