

## ***Interactive comment on “The hostel or the warehouse? Spatiotemporal exposure assessment for natural hazards” by S. Fuchs et al.***

**T. Thaler**

thomasathaler@gmail.com

Received and published: 11 May 2015

This article provides an interesting overview in temporal assessment of buildings and citizens exposed to natural hazards in Austria, including elements at risk to river flooding and mountain hazards. The paper is well written and it was a pleasure to read and to review it. In overall, the topic is highly ‘hot’ and interesting and could make a main contribution in this journal. However, I would suggest that some sections of the paper has to be revised and extended (like also the other three reviewers mentioned). In overall, the paper can be very valuable for the scientific community as well as for decision makers. I consider the paper fitting very well into the scope of NHESS.

My main concerns refer to some points (which most of them are in the line with the

C664

other three reviewers):

No 1 refer to the abstract: I wouldn’t focus so much to the results of this paper, but also mention your used method.

No 2 page 2422, line 5: after ‘on the local scale as a result of individual case studies’: Here, I would like to suggest to add some references (similar to reviewer 2). However, there is no need of a full comparison with other papers, such as reviewer 2 suggested; that’s not the key purpose of this paper.

No 3 page 2423: please, clarify more your research question. However, the paper clearly address the question how property level data can be used in natural hazards research and risk management.

No 4 page 2424, line 5: I don’t agree with this statement, that eHORA is unique in Europe (see also reviewer 3), see also the work done by the Environment Agency or Scottish Environment Agency as a requirement of the EU-Floods directive.

No 5: Discussion and results has to be revised: some aspect were repeated, some aspect weren’t fully explained; please, re-think carefully these two sections. One point, I would like to mention is the annual growth between 1919–1944. That’s somehow obvious that these period show a very low growth rate, because of (1) economic and financial crises, (2) World War II and (3) lack of tourism activities (which started after 1960s/1970s). Further, the key explanation of growth rate after the 1960s/1970s can be observed from the national economic and housing policy.

Finally, I would suggest to include more aspects of the limitations of the data (see also reviewer 1 and following paper: Husby et al. (2015): What if Dutch investors started worrying about flood risk? Implications for disaster risk reduction. Regional Environmental Change.