Journal: NHESS
Title: **The object-specific flood damage database HOWAS21**
Author(s): Kellerman et al.
MS No.: NHESS-2019-420
MS Type: Research Article
Iteration: Second review

I really thank the authors for the efforts put in revising the manuscript. With respect to the two main criticalities I highlighted in my previous review, I think that the explanations of the technical and contents improvements with respect to the version described in Keibrich et al. (2017) overcome the problem of replicability. Still, I am still sceptical on the novelty of applications described in the second part of the paper, whose implementation are not linked to the features od the database itself (e.g., on the usability of information on data quality, on multi-sector data availability) but to the availability of data; indeed, discussed applications are not novel for the authors research group but simply refer to a larger dataset. I agree with authors that the presentation of several exemplary analyses of the HOWAS21 data provides motivation for the community to increase efforts for the collection of more such detailed object-specific damage data, undertake more such forensics analyses and develop better damage models beyond depth-damage functions. I also agree that it is the first time that an analysis of such a big data is performed, leading to some novel results in terms of damage dynamics and drivers in Germany. But, inferring new knowledge from the dataset is not the declared objective of the authors, which is instead i.e. “highlighting exemplary analyses to demonstrate the use of HOWAS 21”. I leave the editor the final decision on this, being my and authors visions in contrast.
Beyond this aspect, the paper was already well written and organised and the new version of the introduction makes the paper even more clear and robust. From this perspective, the paper can be published as its, after the corrections of some typos.