

[Interactive  
Comment](#)

## ***Interactive comment on “Evaluation of coastal vulnerability to flooding: comparison of two different methodologies adopted by the Emilia-Romagna Region (Italy)” by L. Perini et al.***

**L. Perini et al.**

clara.armaroli@unife.it

Received and published: 20 November 2015

We have corrected some words that were not appropriate to describe the methodology. Specifically: page 4326: line 15: "degree of damage to flooding" has been substituted with "exposure"; line 16: "low vulnerable" has been substituted with "low"; "very vulnerable" has been substituted with "high"; lines 19 and 24: "damageable" has been substituted with "exposed" lines 16 and 25: "damage" has been substituted with "exposure"

We have added the following sentence on page 4324, line 7, to better clarify how the wave set-up component was computed: "Wave set-up represents the mean value

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



along the whole regional coastline computed with the LITPACK model of wave time series generated with WAM for different directions, assuming an average bottom slope of 1/50 (Decouttere et al., 1998). WAM results at a depth of 20 m were back tracked to deep water conditions (100 m) through refraction and shoaling. The computations were performed for irregular waves".

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 4315, 2015.

[Interactive  
Comment](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)