

Interactive comment on “Brief Communication: An update of the article “Modeling flood damages under climate change conditions – a case study for Germany”” by F. F. Hattermann et al.

F. F. Hattermann et al.

hattermann@pik-potsdam.de

Received and published: 15 April 2016

I appreciate that the authors made the effort to corroborate the findings of their original paper by using a much larger set of regional climate projections. By this the findings of the original paper are substantially supported, as the authors claimed correctly. Because the approach and methods of the original paper were thoroughly reviewed and discussed and were not changed in this update, they need no further discussion. The use of the additional climate projections for the update is straight forward and correctly implemented, so I don't have any further comments on this as well. However, I have some minor comments regarding the explanation of the damage figures and the con-

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



Interactive
Comment

clusions. The authors should make clear, what kind of damage numbers are shown, even in this update. I believe that the damage figures should be understandable reading this update of the original papers alone. Furthermore the conclusions should be extended to a bit more concrete statements about the increase in damages considering the uncertainties shown in Figure 1. As the numbers are at hand, they deserve to be used. I made some suggestions in the annotated manuscript. It also contains a few more minor, mainly technical comments that should be taken care of.

Reply to the comments: We appreciate very much the very constructive comments of reviewer 1 which will clearly help to improve the Brief Communication.

Comment 1: However, I have some minor comments regarding the explanation of the damage figures and the conclusions. The authors should make clear, what kind of damage numbers are shown, even in this update. I believe that the damage figures should be understandable reading this update of the original paper alone.

Reply to comment 1: We fully agree and will improve the description of the damage data accordingly. Also, we will try to better explain the figures, for example the description of the box-plots, as indicated by reviewer 1 in the annotated PDF document, and will use the median instead of the mean, where possible.

Comment 2: Furthermore the conclusions should be extended to a bit more concrete statements about the increase in damages considering the uncertainties shown in Figure 1. As the numbers are at hand, they deserve to be used.

Reply to comment 2: We agree that the discussion of the increase in damages is a bit unspecific and will try to concretize it more, for example when describing the range of uncertainty in relation to the mean or median of change, as indicated by the reviewer in the PDF document.

Comment 3: I made some suggestions in the annotated manuscript. It also contains a few more minor, mainly technical comments that should be taken care of.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Reply to comment 3: We will take care that all comments in the annotated manuscript will be thoroughly considered in the improved version. Some of the possible improvements are already described in the replies to comment 1 and comment 2 above, and we will also revise the references according to the suggestions of the reviewer.

Interactive comment on *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 3, 7231, 2015.

NHESSD

3, C3386–C3388, 2016

Interactive
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

