

## ***Interactive comment on “SMC-Floods database: A high resolution press database on floods for the Spanish Mediterranean Coast (1960–2015)” by Salvador Gil-Guirado et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 3 March 2019

General comments This is a very interesting paper, well-structured and written. The issues addressed are within the scope of NHES. The construction of the SMC db is of high importance for the analysis of the spatial and temporal changes in the coastal areas vulnerability to floods. Conclusions can be very useful to decision-makers for adaptation planning. The methodology followed for the development of the SMC database is appropriate and well presented. Therefore, the article merits being published, with minor changes. Specific comments 1. My only scientific concern is the use of 2 different averaged indices for the average impact severity. I mean, the intensity level is actually related to the impact magnitude: low damages / major / deaths and/or general destruction. Then the authors produce a damage severity index, which uses in the equation

C1

the intensity level as weight implemented on the various damages occurrence. I can understand that cases can be compared better based on the severity index. However, I am not convinced about the use of 2 ‘average’ values used to evaluate trends or vulnerability at aggregated areas. What is the point? Maybe this could be better explained. 2. In what concerns the structure of the paper, my only concern is the introduction. In page 4, paragraph 4 (lines 24-29) is too methodological to be included in the introduction. It confuses the reader who expects to read the objectives and research questions instead of fragmentary information about methods employed. I suggest this part to be transferred to the methods section. 3. Please consider for your references regarding the databases in other countries also the high-impact weather events database of the National Observatory of Athens, Greece, which is also active on-line, constantly updated and with weather and impact intensity classification (10.5194/nhess-13-727-2013). The NOA db has been also based on press articles. Technical corrections 1. P3, l15: Please delete the ‘y’. 2. P4, l10: Please delete ‘but’. 3. P4, l14: It is ‘flood cases’, not ‘floods cases’. Please repeat correction throughout the article. 4. P4, l15: Please correct as: In this regard it must be clarified the difference between flood cases and flood events 5. P4, l24: Please add ‘digital’ before ‘archives’. 6. P4,l29: The sentence is too big. Please start a new one from ‘in general...’ 7. P4, l33: Please delete ‘This is’, otherwise the sentence does not make sense. In the same sentence, please use the same term throughout the paper regarding the flood ‘case’. You have explained very well in the document the difference between case and event. So, the words ‘episodes’ and ‘events’ in this sentence do not fit. 8. P5, l17: Please correct as ‘emphasized’. Also, please rephrase the entire sentence as it is not clear, especially the second part. 9. P6, l4: Please explain the: (2003: 800) 10. P6, l5: please correct as: These situations 11. P6, l10: please use the same term: environmental or climatic 12. P6, l13: just a thought: is this sentence for Franco necessary? 13. P6, l18: please cut this sentence in 2 parts. it is too big and difficult to read 14. P6, l19: it is weird the use of ‘it has...’ after ‘the following criteria’. I think it can be improved. 15. Table 1: what is MEDIFLOOD? do you mean SMC-Flood db? Also, the authors could enter an

C2

extra column to report the cities of head offices. The full newspaper names could be added here as a comment. 16. P6, last paragraph: the different names are confusing. Consider keeping the short names of Table 1 everywhere in the text. 17. P7, l5: 1) the sentence is too big. Please enter full-stop before 'Taking into account'. 2) Please consider avoiding the footnote since it concerns only one source. You could include it in the text instead. 18. P7, l7: correct as 'validated' 19. P7,l8: please delete 'de'. L10: please add space before 'Secondly'. L22: please correct as 'within' 20. P10, l4: Please begin a new sentence at 'Multiplying...' 21. Table 2: maybe it is better if you write 'average severity index' 22. P11, l7: Please add 'the' before 'number' 23. P11, l8: please consider defining 'average intensity', as this is the first time we read this. 24. P15, l5: 'concentration' of what? I think something is missing 25. P19, l11: Please add 'to' before 'add' 26. P20, l3: please correct as 'makes us'

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-10>, 2019.