



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Uncertainty in flood damage estimates and its potential effect on investment decisions” by D. J. Wagenaar et al.

B. D. Malamud (Editor)

nh-malamud@kcl.ac.uk

Received and published: 2 August 2015

Dear Drs. Wagenaar, de Bruijn, Bouwer and de Moel

Thank you for the submission of your very interesting manuscript "Uncertainty in flood damage estimates and its potential effect on investment decisions".

As you know, two reviewers have now provided detailed reviews, which you have replied in thoughtful detail to. Both reviewers recommended minor revisions (although I have a feeling some of the revisions suggested are not so minor—they may take a bit of time!), and therefore I would like to invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Would you please also provide an 'author's reply' to the reviewers (feel free to use the same words that you used in what you have already uploaded). Please can you also include a track changes document between the old manuscript and the new one (you can include this as part of your 'author's reply').

In addition to the suggestions from the reviewers, I would like to suggest the following technical items, in most cases 'minor': (a) Abstract. Please put into one paragraph. Be a tad more rigorous in reporting data/methods/results in the abstract. So for instance, what percent (or other measure of spread) did the results vary by? (b) In the first paragraph of the intro, please add some references. Please check the rest of the paper for any obvious locations where facts/info/ideas might be better with references. (c) NHESS generally does not use footnotes. See if you can do without. (d) You might find it easier to 'italicise' key words, where definitions are made (e.g., uncertainty). (e) For any currency values, both in text, tables, and figures, tell the reader what year these have been normalized to. (f) Figure 1 caption. Either direct the reader to where the variables are defined, or define them in the caption. (g) Figure 2. Please use the same number of values for precision on the y-axis (e.g., 0.000). In the figure caption, tell us 'how' the probability densities (this is not a pdf yet—as there is no underlying equation) has been derived (method) or direct us to the location in the text. [I personally, when presenting pdf's, generally do not 'smooth' them as you have done, but rather present the probability densities—if you have done something like a kernel density estimation, then tell us in the figure caption). (h) Figure 3. All y-axis and x-axis text needs to be significantly enlarged. Tell the reader in the figure caption that the axes are on different scales. (i) Figure 4. Add N arrow and scale.

Some of my comments may intersect with those of the reviewers, if so, apologies.

I look forward to seeing the next version of your paper.

Regards Bruce D. Malamud NHESS Executive Editor [Professor of Natural & Environmental Hazards, King's College London]

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1424

