

Reply to the comments from Referee #2:

In blue: reviewers' comments

In red: authors' reply

In general, my first impression about the paper is about its practical contribution. People in the Mekong delta have been living in likely free tropical cyclone, storm surge, typhoon environment. It make the people are not really aware about the events when they come. Thus, the risk becomes very high. The paper will definitely contribute to the areas of disaster management and risk reduction in the region and particular in Vietnam. The manuscript can be improved further before publishing on "Natural hazard and Earth System Science"

We wish to express our gratitude for the reviewer's many constructive comments and advice, which will much encourage the authors in its revision. Thank you so much.

Specific comments There are some specific aspects are follows: 1. The author should update the current status of disaster management and risk reduction in Vietnam. Since the Linda happened in 1997 the government has improved a lot of activities to supports people, especially on the aspects of governance (from local to central government), early warning system.

We thank the reviewer for this great suggestion. In fact, we witnessed that a mass mandatory evacuation was successfully organized by local authorities during the recent storm (Tembin). It might not have happened 20 years ago. In the revised manuscript, we will briefly explain the progress of disaster management system in Vietnam over the course of these decades.

2. The manuscript should provide some comparative assessment with other case studies in the world on these topics. The authors mentioned a case in Bangladesh but very limited information.

Yes, we should also introduce some other countries' cases with more detail in the revised manuscript.

3. There should be a summary of the damages crossing different provinces where the Linda passed by and particularly in Con Dao Island, was the whole island got impacts or just some locations. Are they match with the socio surveyed areas.

Strong wind and heavy rain were both recorded in the entire area of Con Dao island, according to local people's story. As the reviewer pointed out, however, the extent of damage was not necessarily uniform. For example, a community near Con Dao market did not suffer from significant damage as their houses were sufficiently strong. On the other hand, many wooden houses on the hillside near Con Dao airport was destroyed by blowing of strong winds. In the revised manuscript, we will describe detailed situations confirmed through the interview survey.

4. The uncertainty of confidence of the Delft3D model should be assessed.

Thank you for the suggestion. We will try to address the reliability of the model by reference to our previous studies.

A 5. The Conclusion/Abstract should be revised to be closer to what have been got.

We thank the reviewer for these comments. Yes, we agree that the Conclusion as well as Abstract should be further improved after the revision.

6. The English writing should be further improved.

The revised manuscript will be checked by a native speaker.

- Line 15-16 (page 1): Mentioned about mangrove which did not really include in the paper.

In response to the reviewer, the term of mangrove in the line concerned will be removed and simply refer to “uninhabited jungle”.

- Line 4-5 (page 2): Should use Vietnamese Mekong delta (hereinafter VMD) because the Mekong delta include Cambodia areas

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We agree to use “VMD” as it would contribute to specify the study area.

- Line 11, line 19 (page 2): should include references

Relevant references will be included in the revised manuscript.

- Line 14 (page 3): should not use TC in the header

We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. TC will be replaced by Tropical Cyclone in the header

Line 17 (page 3): what is the code. Please explain more detail

More detailed description on the model, which is actually a Fortran code, will be added in the revised manuscript.

- Line 9 (page 4): Does the GEBCO data include river (up to Can Tho city) bathymetry? I’m afraid not. Please provide sources of river bathymetry.

We thank the reviewer for pointing this out. Water depths, which have been investigated by multiple institutes and research groups, including the authors’ group, were used in the model for the river. The sources of the bathymetry will be explained with appropriate references in the revised manuscript.

- Line 2 (page 5): Should be Can Tho, not “Can Thao”

Sorry for the typo.

Line 21 (page 5): What is the superscript “5” –

Sorry for the typo.

- Line 29 (page 5): 150 years should be enough (not “or longer”)

We agree to remove “or longer”, which might confuse the reader.

- Line 22 – 30 (page 7): Should provide more information about other cases (in Bangladesh, Myanmar) on wind speed, frequency

We will add supplementary info on winds caused by those cyclones in Bangladesh and Myanmar.

- Line25-26 (page 8): please provide references

- Line 3 (page 9): please provide references

-Line14-15 (page10): please provide references

Relevant references will be included in the revised manuscript.
