

REVIEWER'S REPORT

I have now read the improved version of the research paper with the title „Damage assessment in Braunsbach 2016: A data collection and analysis for an improved understanding of damaging process during flash floods“. The paper has been successfully transformed from a brief communication to a research paper and has been significantly improved, therefore, I believe that it should be considered for publication following some minor revisions. In particular, the following point should be considered:

1. The detailed description of the case study and the event in the introduction seems to me out of place. I would suggest to move the paragraph “Intense rainfall at the end of May (p.2, line 18) ...need to catch up (p.3, line 5)” later in the text, probably in p. 8, at the beginning of the session: Results and discussion.
2. In the abstract the authors suggest that “the results reveal that the damage driving factors of flash floods differ from those of riverine floods to a certain extend”. This suggestion should be discussed more in the text.
3. There is still an inconsistency regarding the number of variables. In p. 9, line 3 you are talking about 21 variables. Yet, the number of variables in Table 1 and Figure 3 is 18, whereas the number of variables in Figures 1 and 2 is 17. Try to be consistent.
4. I have the feeling that “conclusions” should be short, summing up the main results and outcome of the research. What is included now in “Conclusions” I would name “discussion” and move it to the previous chapter. I also think that it would be nice to include in the new “discussion” section a paragraph summing up assumptions and limitations such as “ascending humidity in the walls”, “personal variations in expert judgement”, etc.