



Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Efficient GIS-based model-driven method for flood risk management and its application in central China” by Y. Liu et al.***

**P. Tarolli (Editor)**

paolo.tarolli@unipd.it

Received and published: 3 October 2013

Just a brief comment from my side: I would like to thank the referees for their effort, and raising interesting issues that surely will help the authors in improving the manuscript. This paper has been subject of different stage of review. A rejection occurred at the first stage, but with a suggestion to resubmit the paper, since absolutely it treats topics of interest for NHESS Journal, and natural hazards community. The case study presented is interesting. The second stage of the review, before NHESS discussion, highlighted few technical critical issue to be fixed before the discussion, however the reviewers recognized the great improvement of the work respect to the first submission. I appreciated the effort that the authors spent doing this. The third stage of the review came

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



through the NHESS Discussion. The three reviewers highlighted few more critical issues that need to be clarified and fixed before the final publication. These critical issues can be summarized as follow: 1) English need to be careful checked by a reader, since the text present a lot of grammar errors and unclear sentences; 2) More effort should be spent to better present the main elements of the system described; 3) Demonstrate the claimed superiority of the system described, relative to simpler systems.

Well, while the author can easily overcome the first two issues, the third (very important) needs to be carefully checked. I re-call the final two questions raised by the third reviewer “How is this system superior from other simpler DSS? Can you provide an example showing how this system supports decision in a more efficient way?”. This point needs to be deeply clarified, with clear examples. The Tab.1 provided by the authors in the reply to the third reviewer is not enough. Why not showing a real example with quantitative results?

The remaining critical issues raised by the reviewers have been successfully checked in the discussion.

Minor comments: - Pag. 3, line 26-31: what about the second aspect? - The legend is missed in the Fig.2

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 1535, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper