

Interactive comment on “Flooding in river mouths: human caused or natural events? Five centuries of flooding events in the SW Netherlands, 1500–2000” by A. M. J. de Kraker

dr De Kraker

krakeram@zeelandnet.nl

Received and published: 25 March 2015

Response to Neil Macdonald

Thank you very much for the positive reaction to my paper. The suggestions concerning grammar will be taken care of in the final version. Concerning the need for more references in terms of consulted documentary evidence at archives will be considered in the final version. Writing the paper I have deliberately limited the number of footnote by simply following the guidelines of the journal. This can be achieved by inserting many more footnotes or an extended Appendix. Concerning the need to have some

C681

kind of a ranking in Tables 1 and 2. Ranking very early flooding events is hard because the only information about it is that the event really happened. There is no mention of how long it lasted in terms of days or tides, no information of the extent of flooding, no mention of possible casualties, etc. An additional problem in the Zeeland Delta area of the past is the continuous change of the landscape, which can hardly be measured (in hectares or km²) before 1550. An attempt was made in 2005 to reconstruct both banks of the Western Scheldt, starting with the situation in 2000 and then going back every 25 years. This exercise took us back to 1550 and stopped there because of the many flooding events during that century and therefore the continuous change of the landscape. One thing is certain about the early flooding events, generally documentary evidence, in particular chronicles over-estimated the number of casualties very strongly. I will include the information on the 1953 flood in the Thames estuary. I agree having used the wrong word on page 1456. Climate change has not caused flooding events in Central Europe, only contributed to these events.

Response to Christian Rohr Again I am very grateful with his positive response. Concerning the need of more footnotes, will be taken care of. Concerning the 25 December 1488 (Old Style) should be 1489, he is completely right.

Response to the anonymous referee I have really appreciated your comment in which I have hardly discovered other comments than those mentioned earlier

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 1437, 2015.

C682