

Comment on nhess-2021-269

Anonymous Referee #2

The paper deals with analysis of factors leading to the occurrence of flood fatalities based on review of selected number of per-reviewed research papers published between 2010 and 2020. With respect to great attention devoted to the study of different aspects of flood fatalities it represents an actual topic. The paper has a good potential to be published in Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences.

I thank Anonymous Referee #2 for this comment

I recommend to the author to take in account some points reported below.

General comments:

- Please reconsider the use of terms “fatality” and “victim”. Although fatality is a clear term concentrated only on the death, under victim can be included fatalities and injured what is probably not intention of this article.

I agree with this comment and I can review the entire paper in order to avoid the term “victim” that can be misunderstood.

- Lines 25-26: Related data to July 2021 in Germany are still not available? Any quotation is needed there.

Currently data are available in a Wikipedia page based on local newspapers of the countries affected, and reporting the total number of fatalities. I can quote it (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2021_European_floods).

- Lines 344-349: I have doubts about including “specific occupation” in hazardous behaviour. Please reconsider.

You are right, it seems not appropriate. I can move this sentence to the section concerning vulnerabilities. In fact, people doing some specific occupations are more vulnerable because they are exposed to dangerous situations more frequently than other people (due to their work obligations).

- I recommend to finish Concluding remarks by anything in sense as I tried to express here: “Let us hope that this review showing manifold aspects of the study of flood fatalities will stimulate further research on this field with respect its other aspects, data mining in regions where such data have been not collected yet or where still exists potential for complementing already existing datasets.”

Thank you for this suggestion, I think it can be useful to add a sentence like this to address further research, and put the light on the work that still should be done in the different countries.

- I would like to see anywhere some sentence that selection of papers for the overview does not necessarily cover all spectrum of related FF papers, because FFs can be analysed in the structure followed in this paper also in non-considered papers, e.g. together with other weather-associated fatalities.

I could add a sentence in Section 2, Materials and methods to explain that:

“It must be taken into account that the overview does not necessarily cover all spectrum of related FF papers, but only the papers fitting the selection criteria used in this review (papers published outside the period from 2010 to 2020, i.e., are excluded).”

Specific comments:

Please check if in below quoted cases is the use of related words correct:

Line 43: is it possible to use other form than “a synoptic overview” giving some connotation to meteorology (“synoptic”)?

Yes, it could be changed in “a panoramic framework”

Line 61: rather “and fatality characteristics”. Line 87: “containing contained”?

Yes, it can be changed

Line 113: The rapid onset of flash floods ... a very short time ...

Yes, it can be changed

Line 120: what “the total mortality” you have in mind? total flood mortality?

Yes, *total flood mortality*. It is a mistake, I forgot to specify it.

Line 154: can be only be compared?

It is a mistake: *can only be compared*

Lines 170-172: fatalities instead of victims?

Yes, it must be changed

Line 220: sectors of the globe or rather regions of the globe?

Yes, it can be changed

Line 246: (78%) instead of (78.05%).

Yes, it can be changed

Lines 320-321: abbreviations (WD, SUV) should be explained.

Yes, it can be changed

Lines 353-354: The sentence “The specific ...” is not needed.

I can eliminate it

Line 358: better rainfall totals than rainfall amounts.

Yes, it can be changed

Line 402: mortal flood?

It is a mistake: *fatal flood*

Lines 406-408: what about some official data of national institutions and bodies (ministry, policy, statistical services etc.)?

Yes, these data source can be added. Nevertheless, social media and websites can contain details that institutions often do not collect (also in developed countries), as gender and age of FF, or accident descriptions.

Line 427: advantageous qualities?

I can change in “*The novelty of the study is in the following points*”

Line 428: newness?

I can change in “*novelty*” or in “*originality*”