Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-349-RC2, 2018 © Author(s) 2018. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## **NHESSD**

Interactive comment

## Interactive comment on "Improving accuracy and quantifying uncertainty in flood loss estimations through the use of multi-model ensembles" by Rui Figueiredo et al.

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 20 February 2018

General comments: - This paper is very interesting for the flood risk community.

- Title: The title could be more attractive. What accuracy will be improved? Accuracy of damage estimates?
- Abstract: The abstract could be formulated even more concrete and to the point. In addition, I miss here the view of the concrete result of the paper. The abstract is very general. That could make you more attractive.
- What I miss completely is the explanation of how the 20 models were applied to the areas:

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



- \* Which adjustments had to be made in the model or in the dataset (resolution, aggregation of land use)?
- \* Which assumptions had to be made?
- \* What land use data was used for Italy?
- \* One should contrast the input variables for both cases in a table.
- \* Can one compare both cases without hesitation or do the input data / assumptions differ too much?

I do not see this kind of discussion in the paper.

- There is no representation of the damage estimates of the models. How are the different locations considered in the results of the damage models? Why does one model give good results for Germany and bad ones for Italy? In my opinion, there is no detailed discussion of the damage estimates and the model results.

Specific comments: - Please see the attached file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2017-349/nhess-2017-349/

RC2-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-349, 2017.

## **NHESSD**

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

