

Interactive comment on “Identifying urban areas prone to flash floods using GIS – preliminary results” by Marzena Wicht and Katarzyna Osinska-Skotak

Marzena Wicht and Katarzyna Osinska-Skotak

mwicht@gik.pw.edu.pl

Received and published: 15 January 2017

Marzena Wicht

RC = Reviewer comment AR = Authors reply

RC:

The paper aims at presenting a simplified methodology to identify urban areas prone to urban flooding due to intense precipitation. In my opinion, this paper does not present novel approaches in the fields of GIS or pluvial flood modelling. As the authors present in the paper, the GIS methodologies used are well known and available at most of GIS software and the methodology pre- sented lacks some of the advanced hydraulic anal-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



ysis essential to fully understand the hydraulic behaviour of urban drainage systems. Throughout the paper the authors identify some limitations of the presented study, e.g. the quality of the data sets is not adequate (e.g. too coarse) (lines 1-4 of Page 9) and the sewer network and the dynamics of urban drainage systems (especially during flooding events) is not considered (Line 16 in Page 16). The authors seem aware of these limitations as they point various possibilities for further investigations. They should include these further investigations in the paper and, for example, use them as benchmark to assess the accuracy of the results obtained using the presented "simplified" methodology. The methodology requires the use of a value of precipitation (in this case 39 mm/m² - Page, line 28). Maybe the authors can relate this to a precipitation return period? of course the methodology does not consider the precipitation duration, but perhaps the concept of return period could be considered in the methodology!? 39 mm/m² shall cause no relevant flooding issues if it happens during the time period of one month (see Tab 2 in page 8). The structure of the paper must be revised, e.g. Section 1.2. seems too long; is all this information relevant to fully understand the paper? Figure 4 caption is not related to the presented figure and is the same as Figure 6. Also, the quality (e.g. resolution and size) of the figures may be improved. The level of English shall be improved: minor typos and major grammar deficiencies make the paper difficult to read.

AR:

On the behalf of the authors, I would like to thank the reviewer for all the comments and suggestions on our manuscript. In the revised version of it we will try to address all mentioned issues and include some (available) possibilities to overcome present limitations, which we can address now and couldn't back at the time when manuscript was submitted. However, the focus of this study was to utilize already available GIS tools in the hydrological field (contrary to hydrological models) with much simplified approach, where the lack of the advanced hydraulics analysis is not an obstacle to perform the analysis. In the revised version of the manuscript we will naturally address

HESSD

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



the structure and writing style.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-518, 2016.

HESSD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

