

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 #2

Received and published: 5 March 2019

General comments: The paper “SMC-Floods database: A high resolution press database on floods for the Spanish Mediterranean Coast (1960-2015)” provides a preliminary description and analysis of flood data collected from press news. It is not a novel initiative at European or Spanish level, but it comprises a large extension of a flood damage prone region. I admit that such effort merits publication somewhere, but not in the present format, which requires a major review before it can be published. In scientific outcomes are highly bias by the journalist judgment of the flood damages and newspaper coverage and audience. Therefore, caution should be placed on the interpretation of the data. There is not a critical analysis of the results in relation to other more robust database, for instance the analysis from the National Insurance Consor-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



tium. As this database reflects risks (mostly exposure and vulnerability), most of the hydroclimatologic trends and changes on hydroclimatic conditions may not be valid.

There are a number of points that the authors should correct. 1.- The manuscript requires a detail English correction on the style. It looks a direct translation from a Spanish text, I would say that the authors used google translator, otherwise, I cannot explain the use of some very incorrect terms. Among the most critical one are “Cold Drop” cited in the paper, and probably authors refer to “cold pool” or “mean mobile” (cited in figure 7) instead of “moving average”. These are only few examples, but the text is full of informal terms or sentences that do not make any sense in English. 2.- The manuscript is very long and this makes difficult to read. The authors should analyze in each sentence and use proper language addressing the point in a direct way. 3.- Several sections can be shortened, including the introduction and conclusions. 4.- Abstract: The abstract should be completely re-written. The way it is written looks and introduction rather than a summary. Sentences such as “Floods are the natural disaster that affects the greatest number of people and causes the highest economic losses in the world” are fine for the introduction, but not for the abstract. Please, start the abstract by telling the reader at once what the paper is: new data, a review of progress, a new technique, a synthesis, or whatever describes the nature of the paper. Unnecessary descriptive phrases and qualifiers should be left out of the abstract. Write the abstract as styled summary of its essential information; and include as much specific information as possible on the results. 5.- Introduction: There is a long description of flood databases from press news in Europe and the world, and they do not provide any key information to objective or analysis to be addressed by the MSC database. I would suggest leaving only the most relevant databases, and includes the rest on a table indicating the country, region, time period covered, data source, type of data included, authors. 6.- Page 4. Introduction Lines 24 to 30 I suggest to move to methodology section 7.- Page 4 introduction. Lines 31 to end of section, I suggest to delete this paragraph. Instead you should describe the specific objectives of this study. 8.- Page 6, lines 13 to 15 probably not needed, delete. 9.- Page 8. Indicate the

list of damage types in a single line. 10.- Type of damages. Here roads and housing are the most common ones. I wonder if the news are bias to these two types because of most easy ones to be reported right after the event. 11.- page 10 line 25. How the quantity of damage was calculated?. In the case of housing, are you reporting the number of affected houses, or on roads, the number of cut roads. . .? 12 Page 15. “cold drops” is a direct translation of the Spanish informal term. Please, use “cold pool” or mesoscale convective systems. 13.- Page 15. From line 20 to 28, it is poorly written and they need major changes. 14. Page 17. Line 6. I don’t understand “the latitudinal gradient referred to above continues to be reflected. 15. Page 18. Line 25-27. This is not surprising due to the press nature of the database. As more small villages are cited on the newspaper, the flood extend on the database increases. 16 Page 19. Lines 10-11. The sentence “The fact that the floods of L1 consider not only river floods (also consider flash floods and in situ floods), can magnify the importance of the increase in exposure, as to the growth of the exposed surface in flood zones.” I wonder if the main problem is the nature of the database, because social perception of risk increase with time, since any single damage is reported on the local news. 17.-Conclusions should go to the point of the main results. In the present format, there are too long, and they should be shortened.

In summary, the manuscript requires major changes before the manuscript can be published. The authors should made major improvements on the English edition, including major rewritten of the manuscript. Several sections should be reduced according to the above changes.

Other minor changes are suggested on the pdf document.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2019-10/nhess-2019-10-RC2-supplement.pdf>

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



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

NHESSD

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

