



## ***Interactive comment on “Levee reliability analyses for various flood return periods – a case study in Southern Taiwan” by W.-C. Huang et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 3 March 2015

General: the paper is interesting and gives a good example of detailed graphical aids for levee management. However, the language should be improved. The quality of the English is poor. With some effort, it can be understood what is meant, but reading is unnecessarily difficult. Several passages are unnecessary long, e.g. on p.475 lines 1-9 the extensive repetition of the introduction seems superfluous.

Some details at the beginning of the paper: - p.458 lines 21-24: apart from the failure mechanisms already mentioned (where (1) should be both (wave) overtopping and overflowing), also (5) sliding/instability of the dike body itself can be a cause of failure. - p. 459 line 2: also the properties of the foundation material(s) are important (otherwise mechanisms (2-4) mentioned before could not occur). - p. 461 line 15 / Table 1: what precisely is the difference between 'breached for about x m' and 'total collapse', if the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



total length is not given? For 3 and 4, it's better to indicate the length too. Now it can be reconstructed that the total length of these two levees is about 1.0 km, that's a bit indirect.

I think reviewer #1 has done a good job with his/her comments.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 457, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

