

Response to Peer Review Comments

Referee #2:

To my understanding there are some methodological inconsistencies in the paper:

1) Validation is often mixed with calibration

- We appreciate your comment. This issue has been resolved in the next version.

2) The damage functions are calibrated based on empirical data and then validated by the same data set which is not scientific sound, however, there are several other flood events listed

- The reviewer is correct. Based on the reviewer suggestion, the newly derived model will be calibrated with the historic data collected from Bundaberg region. Afterwards, performance of all applied models, for estimation of structural damage in the Australian study area, will be validated by the dataset collected from Maranoa region.

3) Transferability of methods is not discussed (as the method was derived for two areas, but not applied elsewhere)

- We are grateful for this comment. In the next version, the objective of study will be modified.

I would, therefore, suggest to re-submit a revised paper by means of: (i) describing and conducting a clear methodology and wording (ii) applying the findings of the two case-studies in other areas (iii) concluding based on calibration and validation results

- We appreciate your suggestions. We will modify the paper by considering these issues.