

Interactive comment on “Deriving global flood hazard maps of fluvial floods through a physical model cascade” by F. Pappenberger et al.

Dr. Schröter

kai.schroeter@gfz-potsdam.de

Received and published: 19 June 2012

I really liked to read this paper on the compilation of global flood hazard maps using ‘physically based’ model cascades since I am currently involved in a comparable endeavour even though on a much smaller scale. Still there are some issues I would like to comment on and recommend to improve understandability.

Without question, uncertainties and limitations are an important aspects to adress. Given the numerous sources of uncertainty involved in the application of a cascade of different models and underlying data I think it is important to name these sources in detail and to discuss their potential implications on the results. Likewise the relative contribution of the different uncertainty sources should be ranked at least in a qualita-

C2333

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



tive way. Otherwise the uncertainty bounds included in Fig. 4 and table 2 (which only refer to the uncertainty stemming from the extreme value statistics, right?) run the risk to draw an excessively optimistic picture of the performance of the overall approach.

Further the labelling of figures 5 and 6 is confusing because the colour palette does not include the colour white. Presumably these cells are below the minimum threshold of 5% as mentioned in the text (page 6625 line 6).

The comparison to the benchmark data is discussed using several performance scores. In the text it is stated (page 6628 line 2) that ETS is above 0 for all return periods, i.e. 2 to 500 years. However the corresponding figures 7 and 8 are limited to return periods of 75 and 80 years. Is this due to a limitation in the benchmark data?

The use of the term rating curve on (page 6632 line 13) should be supplemented with a note on the data base or methodology of how these 'rating curves' have been derived. This is to avoid misconceptions with the term rating curve at a gauge.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 6615, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

