

Interactive comment on “Causes and systematics of inundations of the Krasnodar territory on the Russian Black Sea coast” by N. I. Alexeevsky et al.

S. Fuchs (Referee)

sven.fuchs@boku.ac.at

Received and published: 4 February 2016

The authors present an overview on inundation hazard and risk for the Russian Black Sea coast, spanning from flood hazard assessment and the roots causes of inundation to elements at risk and losses. Comprehensive overviews on natural hazards and risk in Russia are generally underrepresented in the English scientific literature so far. As such, this is a topic of considerable relevance to the readers of Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences.

Therefore, the work should be considered for publication. However, some of the content needs additional efforts before this manuscript may become acceptable for publication. Please find my remarks below.

Abstract, line 13: insert a “the” before Krasnodar

C1

Abstract, line 16 ff: the verb is missing in this sentence

Introduction, first and second para: please provide evidence for the numbers given, e.g. references

Objectives. . .: please check the use of “km²” (same page 6, lines 2 and 3)

Objectives. . ., line 14: please provide evidence for the number given, e.g. a reference

Hydrological data. . ., line 22: replace “for days” by “diurnal”. This paragraph describes data which is not represented in Table 1. Could you please add this information to Table 1?

Inundations. . ., line 16: what is meant by the term “mastered terrains” (same page 11, line 5)?

Inundations. . ., line 19/20: should be “Alekseevsky and Magritsky (2013)”

Inundations. . ., page 10, lines 1 and 23: please explain the type 1 inundations a bit more, and take care to use the same wording (“Inundations of mixed type (No1). . .” versus “mixed type 1 inundations” since it makes the text more accessible when using similar expressions.

Page 13, line 8: please provide a short explanation on the “western jet 2”.

Page 13, lines 19/20: Please check reference.

Page 15, lines 15-20: Please provide reference for the numbers given.

Page 29, line 6: Please check the use of “cloud burst”

Page 30, line 6: instead of “in danger” please use the more technical term “at risk”

All Maps (figures): please insert a North arrow and a measured grid (geographical coordinates).

Figure 1 would benefit from an additional small overview map on the Black Sea with

C2

the surrounding countries.

Figure 3: what is meant by “line of height mark of the dangerous phenomenon” – needs clarification.

Figure 4: The legend is not logic to me; both points show “number of events (of) no more than 1-2” and “. . .less than 3” – needs clarification.

Figure 5: The legend needs clarification; why the isobar in proximity to the river has higher numbers? Would it be possible just to use “1, 2 and 3 m above water level” or sth. similar?

Figure 6: What is meant by “social important objects”? – infrastructure? residential housing?

Figure 11: What does the small graph stand for? – needs explanation.

Over all, the materials presented are definitely worth being included in the target journal. I suggest that the authors perform a minor revision of the manuscript before it will be published.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2015-335, 2016.