

***Interactive comment on “Research article:
Household resilience to major slow kinetics
floods: a prospective survey of the capacity to
evacuate in high rise buildings in Paris” by
Nathalie Rabemalanto et al.***

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 4 July 2020

My concern about this article is the positioning in terms of the potential aid for decision maker, at least the Paris City council services. About this I can see at least 4 weaknesses in the proposed research:

1. The paper is about evacuation capacities of high rise buildings in Paris, in a context of slow flooding process. The river Seine has indeed a slow flooding process and the evidence is that plenty of time is available to evacuate! Why a scientific method is needed for this? Does it really help anyone?

C1

2. Another weakness in the approach choosed is the lack of integration of other services that need to act to protect themselves from floodings. I guess RATP, EDH and others have to act to reduce the vulnerability of their systems (see Serre and Toubin research for example) during this lap of time. These past research works showed that many services, as well as road availability is subject to uncertainties... Why this point is not included here despite its criticity?

3. You tried to define vulnerability profile of inhabitants of such high buildings. Several researches in this area are available and recognised worldwide. Unfortunately these approaches are not even prestented in the paper. For example, how did your proposed evaluation is getting deeper than approaches proposed by Cutter for example?

4. for me, the real problem in such flooding context is not the evacuation process: city managers know how to evacuate cities with million of people. The most important question is: how can we organise the come back home when flooding duration may exceed one month?

To conclude, I do think the reserch proposed does not sound at all with the real need of the City of Paris and Prefecture need in terms of contingency and flood risk management and rescue strategies.

For all these major reasons, I recommend to reject this article proposition.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-150>, 2020.

C2