Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

EGU

Interactive comment on "Towards impact-based flood forecasting and warning in Bangladesh: a case study at the local level in Sirajganj district" by Fabio Sai et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 11 June 2018

Review of "Towards impact-based flood forecasting and warning in Bangladesh: a case study at the local level in Sirajganj district" by Sai et al. The paper describes a case study carried out to test different ways of relaying information on floods to stake-holders. The idea was to use colour-coding based on impact levels designed and decided by the sector experts themselves. Although I find the study very interesting and well-timed, I am reluctant to call this a research paper. It reads more like a preliminary report or an opinion paper. I am in favour of publishing the paper, but struggle to see where it could fit. I therefore restrain to make a recommendation, but leave that in the hands of the editor. Scientific contribution The major limitation of the study is that it is setup as a social science study, but without the social science carried out

C1

within it. It would have been very useful to better understand how and why the actors understand or do not understand/trust/use forecasts in impacts. This would have made an entirely different paper which would have contained analysis and conclusions and a way forward to improve the forecasting. As it stands now, it is more an opinion piece, or a preliminary study on how to sue the forecasts. This is also interesting, the but scientific analysis is missing. I would therefore either reject the paper on the grounds of not being scientific, or rather transfer it to an opinion paper and allow the authors to be even more bold in discussing the pros and cons as well as outlinng future research in more detail. Presentation The paper is generally well-written, but the figures needs to be improved. if this turns into an opinion paper, I would suggest to restructure the paper as well, to follow the line of reasoning of a discussion paper. Minor comments P1, L24. Change to "short-term" and "long-term" P2, L10. Please put proper references to this statement "A complete and effective EWS comprises of four inter-related elements: a) risk knowledge, b) monitoring and warning service, c) dissemination and communication and d) 10 response capability." P2. L19. I am not convinced by this: "The term "impact-basedâĂ§ aims to translate the hydro- meteorological forecast by shifting the paradigm towards end users, which is forecasting the expected consequences of hazards for different sectors of interest.". Impact-based forecasts are useful at all levels, not only end-users. Also, forecasters should be helped by them in order to categorize the hazards in different risk levels. P4, L8-24. This description is very detailed, and I suggest to shorten it P5. L22-26. I am not sure I fully understand the method of creating the impact-based forecasts. Were these done individually for each point?