



Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Considering hazard estimation uncertain in urban resilience strategies” by B. Barroca et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 3 July 2014

The abstract falls into the classic trap of being an introduction, not a proper summary of the content of the paper. 'Territoire' and 'territory' are false friends.

Page 4237, line 2: What do you mean by social acceptance?

It appears from the introduction that this is an article about flood hazard models applied to buildings and infrastructure. If that is the case, the abstract is thoroughly misleading.

Page 4245, line 2: how can you comment on the strategy for implementing resilience, when all you have done is some flood routing?

I do not recommend publication of this paper. It has nothing new to offer and is also disjointed. The introduction makes a number of well-known observations about hazards

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



and resilience. The flood-routing analysis produces equivocal results (see page 4244, lines 20-22) and the subsequent recommendations are too well-known—one would even say well-worn—to be worth stating again. Moreover, they do not follow from the previous section on flood prediction.

If we are to make any progress on flood risk amelioration we have to stop repackaging common and well-known approaches and start to use a more genuinely interdisciplinary approach that sheds new insight onto the problem. This paper does none of that.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 4235, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

