

Interactive comment on “Flood risk analysis of the Limpopo River basin through past evolution reconstruction and geomorphological approach” by M. Spaliviero et al.

M. Spaliviero et al.

mathias.spaliviero@unhabitat.org

Received and published: 25 May 2014

First, the authors would like to highlight that, differently from the first Referee, this second (anonymous) Referee accepts the title as it is proposed.

The second Referee makes very interesting suggestions, and the authors would like to thank the Referee for finding the objectives of the paper substantial and praiseworthy. Indeed the discussion could be further strengthened, however the authors believe that with the amount of evidence and literature provided, and the role of the detailed maps, the connections between geological evolution and flooding are clearly explained.

C839

The reference to “scientific references” could be changed to “references found in literature”. However it should be noted that the large majority were extracted from scientific journals...

When the authors write “it is our opinion” they refer to scientific conclusions based on their work and what is being explained, which do not exist in literature. If there is another manner or a better formula to introduce NEW knowledge in a scientific paper, we will be happy to comply with it.

As for the proposed re-structuring of the article, the authors are willing to do it, if the Editor thinks that it will strengthen the objectives the paper is trying to achieve. The authors think that the re-structuring will give a lot of work (it implies even changing some of the figures and adding some new ones) and the new sequence of ideas will not automatically reinforce the points being made. There is a logic behind the currently proposed structure of the paper which aims particularly to facilitate the understanding of the reader, as a lot of information has been gathered for reconstructing the geological/geomorphological evolution of the river and making clear linkages with the areas prone to flooding.

The authors leave the decision to the Editor on how best to proceed.

The proposed minor corrections are well-taken and will be done once the Editor requests it.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 1367, 2014.

C840