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This manuscript presents the brief communication of the 1998 flood in China. This topic is related to the scope of this journal. The authors discussed the rapid urbanization and climate change pose new challenges and rethink whether China is prepared for the next mega-flood. However, this manuscript still need to addresses and clarifies several points before it can be accepted. The following comments may help enhancing the quality of this work.

1. Scientific writing: The manuscript must be professionally proofread and edited. In addition, the authors may pay attention to some aspect of the conventional research writing. Although it is a brief communication, the structure of the manuscript should be enough, especially the connection between the sentences, the components/structure of the key parts (Abstract, Introduction, body, Conclusion).

2. This brief communication discussed the 1998 flood in China, how about the recent flood, such as flood in 2018 in China. The southern China suffered server floods in 2018. It is suggested to make a comparison between the 1998 flood and 2018 flood in China. The flowing references may be help to strengthen this study. “Flooding hazards across southern China and prospective sustainability measures.” 3. The short communication should discuss the perspective of flood disaster management, e.g. flood risk assessment and prediction. The following publications are refered: “Flood risk assessment in metro systems of mega-cities using a GIS-based modeling approach” “Assessment of geohazards and preventative countermeasures using AHP incorporated with GIS in Lanzhou” 4. The abstract is too short. Although this is a short communication, the problem, method and results should be included in the abstract.