

Interactive comment on “Weight analysis of dam break risk consequences influencing factors” by Zongkun Li et al.

Zongkun Li et al.

21872168@qq.com

Received and published: 15 November 2018

Thank you for your good comments. According to your comments, the response are as the following: 1. Admittedly, there is a dilemma in the calculation of factor weights: the weight of one or some factors may be too large to make other factors dispensable in calculating the result. However, if the distribution of factor weights is too average or scattered, the calculation of factor weights will lose its significance. This manuscript is different from the previous articles, either only for 3-4 first-level impact indicators, or only for a second-level indicators, considered 20 typical second-level indicators for the first time. From the results of this study, the new model does avoid the problem of too decentralized average weight, and the number of 20 does not cause the scattered problems. 2. On the issue of mutual interference between factors, experts

C1

are required to mark the indicators based on the impact of indicators on the overall risk consequences. So, the social impact of population loss has been supposed to be taken into account, which would not cause the above mentioned problem. Welcome further discussion and thanks a lot.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-265>, 2018.

C2