

Interactive comment on “New insights into flood warning and emergency response from the perspective of affected parties” by H. Kreibich et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 19 June 2016

An interesting paper which can provide some insight into the impacts of flood warning on damage reduction – but it could be enhanced by paying some attention to the following points:

The paper was not well linked to previous literature (and theory) about why or why not people take action in response to warnings or take pro-active measures to help save damages.

There needs to be a clearer definition/discussion in the text about what you mean by flood warning (e.g. are unofficial and official warnings included?) Although there is differentiation about this later on – a brief introduction to these in section 3.1 would be useful for readers less familiar with the subject.

More information should be provided about the events themselves (e.g. depths, velocities, areas affected, duration, rate of rise) as this may be critical to the difference in action – you mentioned they type of floods that they were and the lead time, but are there also other differences which might account for differences in action (e.g. external emergency assistance, numbers of people affected, concentration/distribution of those flooded (e.g. were people able to assist each other) the severity of the events (e.g. was more attention paid to evacuation and preventing injuries and fatalities than saving damages))

Coupled with the above point, you mention that there have been improvements in the FW systems between 2002 and 2013, but can you provide more detailed information about what these improvements have been (e.g. numbers of warnings, increase in coverage, improved forecasting, improved lead time, changes in warning dissemination mechanisms etc).

What is meant by perceived effectiveness and how was this measured. Is perceived effectiveness related to how many damages those flooded felt that a measure saved (i.e. post event) or is it related to how many damaged those at risk felt that a measure would save (i.e. pre-event and related to the likelihood of uptake of measures)

P3 – line 10 – the difference in sampling is not entirely clear. Please expand on this and provide more information about this and the impact on the results.

Are the differences between the two events statistically significant? Have you performed any analysis of this?

Are you able to comment on how these flood warnings links to other aspects of flood risk management, as this may impact on flood warning actions (e.g. presence of compensation/insurance, financial incentives/grants for taking individual action to prevent flooding).

Do you have any comment on the international significance of the results? What do

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



the results say about improving the response to flood warnings in terms of damage reduction

The paper needs a good English proof-read.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-133, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

