

Comments Anonymous Referee #1	Adaptions
I recommend the section 1.1 Sensitivity analysis includes to chapter 2. Methods. It should be described more precisely how were stated the scenarios for sensitivity analysis. As well described more precisely how were stated total damage costs and total damage area.	Thank you for this comment. I will add a few lines to explain the scenarios and the total damage cost and damaged area to improve the clarity of the text.
The authors used average values for the material cost and the building surface area – are these values market values in Jamaica? Or? How was state average maximum road damage? Also how was stated average cost of the crops?	The material cost and building surface area are average market values in Jamaica from 2012, that we've received from ODPEM. I will adapt the text to clarify this. The average road damage is based on the average road value in developing countries, as stated by Collier et al (2013). I will add the source for this information. The average crop values were gathered from FAOSTAT. It is true that these average values are not properly explained in the text and I will clarify and adapt this.
How the authors mean the expression in row 29 (chapter 2)... Eleven other scenarios, each with "less or less" detailed input...	This expression was meant as "less input data or less detailed input data". The second "less" thus belongs to "detailed". To clarify this, I've added commas in the sentence: "Eleven other scenarios, each with less, or less detailed, input data...".
Please express clearly (row 29, chapter 5) the resulted indication which data is indispensable and which data can be adopted, replaced or ignored in a risk assessment. Will these data be valid for Jamaica study only or generally?	It is true that this section needs some extra clarification. In this research, the scenario that uses population density has the best results. Furthermore, the importance of an adequate road network in order to improve the visual result, has been indicated. In order to validate this results, other research areas need to be tested. This will help in determining the possibilities of general use.
Figures – I recommend formal correction – in Fig 4 and Fig 8 is missing marking S1, S11, S12.	Thank you for noticing this, I will add the missing markers in all figures.
Another formal correction is in row 11 in chapter 4 – Figure 9.	This was indeed an error that I've overlooked. Thank you for pointing this out, I will adjust it.
Formal correction – use jointly: benchmark or bench mark.	I've checked the text and all 'bench mark' notations are corrected into 'benchmark'.
The newer investigations in the field of interests – flood risk assessment model should be presented in the paper (chapter 1)	Thank you for this comment. I will expand the introduction by adding recent developments in the field of flood risk assessment.
I recommend including more peer reviewed journals as reference in the introduction section as well as in the Methodology section.	By adding the recent developments in the field of risk assessment, more journals will be added. Furthermore, the clarifications needed in the methodology section will also be supported by extra references.