

## ***Interactive comment on “Application of flood risk modelling in a web-based geospatial decision support tool for coastal adaptation to climate change” by P. J. Knight et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 24 March 2015

\*General comments:

This paper presents a very interesting web-based tool for assessing coastal flood risk from sea level rise, storm surge and river flows. The paper is well written and structured, and the decision support tool provides very useful information for both operational and strategic decision making, in a user-friendly environment.

\*Specific comments:

The paper is not focused on flood modelling but on the development of the web-based tool, so it refers to a very recently published paper (Prime et al., 2015) for details about

C292

the modelling procedure. Even so, it would be convenient to include in this paper some information regarding the flood model steps and the procedure for calculating the associated economic cost. Additionally, some comments about the expectations on future applicability of the tool would also be interesting: are there any public institutions or private companies interested in the development of the tool for other areas? Finally, some changes should be made in the maps, as the location of some features and landmarks is not clear from current figures. I would suggest including insets in Fig. 1b and 1c to show the main features in both areas, which now can only be seen in the Results figures.

\*Technical corrections:

1- Introduction Page 2, line 8: Change “we’ve entered” to “we have entered”. Page 2, lines 25-32: The difference between SDSS and EDSS is not clear from the explanation. It is better to define SDSS first, and then include the example with the reference of Shim et al. (2002). Page 2, line 31: Change “graphical” to “geographical”. Page 3, line 17: Change “have developed” to “has developed”.

3- Case studies Page 5, lines 15-17: The position of River Wyre, Morecambe Bay and The Mount should be indicated in the location map (see specific comment above). Page 6, lines 9-10: The position of the pumping station and the river Oldbury Pill should be indicated in the location map (see specific comment above). Page 6, line 10: Fig. 3 should not be cited before Fig. 2.

4- Flood modelling Page 7, line 11: Better change “return level” to “return period”. Page 9, line 2: Change “wave overtopping in reduced” to “wave overtopping is reduced”. Fig. 3a and 3b: It would be better to use a colour other than blue for depicting the electricity pylon routes, to avoid confusion with water courses. Page 10, line 22: Change to “as indicated in Fig. 3b by A and B, respectively”.

5- Discussion Page 11, lines 25-28: This is a nice statement, but it does not have any relation with the paper. It would be good to add some comments on how the DST

C293

developed in this paper accounts for this “overarching” fact. Page 12, lines 5-7: This is repeated from the Introduction. Page 13, line 4: Change “the DST also helps to user to identify” to “the DST helps users to identify”. Page 13, lines 8-10: This is repeated from the Introduction. Page 13, line 23: Flood depth and duration are not so clear from Fig. 3a and 3b.

6- Conclusions Page 15, line 7: Change “combinations therefore” to “combinations thereof”. Page 15, lines 13-14: Change “The DST also offers to capability to undertake” to “The DST also offers the capability to undertake”.

References: Page 22, lines 11-12: The reference by Van Koningsveld et al. is missing the paper title.

Figure captions: Caption in Fig. 3b should include the explanation of the points indicated by the A and B red squares.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 1615, 2015.