

Interactive comment on “Social media as an information source for rapid flood inundation mapping” by J. Fohringer et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 28 July 2015

The article presents a very important problem of flood monitoring using a blend of authoritative and non-authoritative methods.

In particular it leverages data from tweeter and flicker during the Dresden flood of 2013. This is a very good test case because it is recent and it is possible to fuse multiple heterogeneous data available.

Weakness: The major weakness is in the presentation of the results. They include only a series of maps that show areas likely to be inundated, but there is no discussion of how good this estimation is. For example, have the authors tried to compare their results with other estimates of the inundated area? How are these results comparing? Is it possible to quantify the relative improvement introduced by the use of volunteered

C1396

information?

P4234: A tool is mentioned, but no details are given to it. Is it available and for public use?

P4235: Citation to Crooks et al. seems out of place. I suggest removing it. If the authors wish to discuss tweeter use related to earthquakes, there are several official USGS govmt reports that give a concise summary of the capabilities and its effective usage.

P4243: How is it possible to estimate the inundation depth? This is mentioned throughout the manuscript and it seems to be crucial to the methodology.

Minor comments: Overall, URL links should be added in the references or perhaps in the footnotes. There are a few typos and spelling. There should also be a consistency between the US and British spelling throughout the manuscript.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 4231, 2015.

C1397