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1) “[The methods] are not so much applied for coastal flooding, where hazard or scenarios mapping remains more common than complete risk assessment. This could be raised in the introduction, showing also what benefits for end-users can be obtained from risk assessment approaches compared to assessments limited to hazard or single flooding scenarios.”

Indeed the authors feel the benefits of a complete risk assessment could be discussed and emphasized in the introduction and would include this in future editions.


This study could be referenced and discussed.

3) “I suggest to rephrase it, highlighting that risk quantifies the expected damages over a given period over a location, and therefore combines hazard, vulnerability, exposure (and eventually coping capacity)”

The authors agree that the paragraph needs a bit more focus and could state that flood risk assessment is commonly used and has common elements. Could mention that there are other definitions of risk including terms such as hazard and vulnerability.

4) “(given the fact that under the assumptions made here, the more frequent and less damaging event do not need to be considered). This is mentioned in the conclusion, but I recommend to discuss this point more clearly page 835”

The Authors could include this in page 835.

5) “flow velocity is important as well for mortality. Why ? Is this because the mortality functions are based on observations, which did not include anything regarding flow velocity ?”

Flow velocity is included in other criterion, not met by the hydraulic characteristics modeled in these scenarios. More detailed discussion of these characteristics and there impact on the mortality could be included.
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