

Interactive comment on “A quality assessment framework for natural hazard event documentations: application to trans-basin flood reports in Germany” by S. Uhlemann et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 May 2013

GENERAL COMMENTS: This article deals with the usefulness of the "grey literature" in the study and analysis of natural hazards, especially in the case of floods in Germany. The authors analyse a series of documents and data extracted from various sources of information not covered in scientific journals. To do that, authors use an evaluation procedure based on the score of different parameters. The methodology is proven by a nonparametric statistical test to see the plausibility of the findings from two experts responsible to score a sub-sample of the studied documents. The work is innovative and addresses a current issue, because there are many studies published outside SCI journals routes, made by excellent professionals who for one reason or

C174

another (i.e. lack of means, tradition or linguistic problems) have not published their work in international journals. For this reason, I deem the publication of this work and opening up a wider debate about the usefulness of this type of information in scientific works. It should assume that the use of grey literature is subject to the control of the author and, therefore, they are responsible for checking the veracity of their references. I agree with the use of this type of information (after his selection) in scientific scopes. An example here is the called methodology: sources-pathway-receptors and consequences: what's different between this method and the classical method of analysis of events (and widely used), which always studied the trigger, the process and their consequences? However, I think the article is too long. This sometimes makes it difficult to follow. I encourage the authors to do an exercise in synthesis and eliminating repeated paragraphs. Methodologically, I think the statistical test used may be acceptable although very few experts were selected for reviewing the sub-sample of documents. Do you believe that more experts could change the score-results? On the other hand, one expects to see an analysis of what is the minimum number of documents that must be scanned for a significant improvement on the information. Based on your work, Is it possible to do this analysis? (I think that it is depending of different things, like the number of existing documents, the natural processes, the origin, etc. . .). Finally, authors are really focusing on floods, do authors believe that the methodology is directly extensible to other processes?, or it is depending on the type of process (I mean, the evolution of the state of knowledge of the various natural processes could affect the methodology)

More specific question: You are using many times i.e and parentheses, even though the information is also in the appendix section; you also include it in the text. I think that you can delete information repeated. Page 147, line 14. May be paleohydrologist methods can be here also cited. Page 150, line 3-5. Why? They are not interesting? Page 150, line 25: user is needs, instead user's needs Page 151, line 20-21 what's new in this concept? Page 153, line 15-28: It looks like an introduction paragraphs. Please consider to move it to this section Page 161. Line 2: 2 scientific expert is a low number

C175

for statistical analysis. Perhaps the results could be biased. If the authors can not improve this point, at least should address this issue in the discussion methodological. In my opinion, the summary section is not needed if authors make a great effort to reduce the size of the manuscript, because they will get a more readable work.

My decision: Accepted after minor revision. Authors should reduce the length of the manuscript and delete repeated paragraphs. One way to do it would be to remove information from the manuscript, because there is a lot of information in the text should not appear again in the text (i.e. a detailed explanation of each parameter analysed).

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 143, 2013.