

(p.4, lines 29-34) Another weakness in the method is that the actual, real flood protection level is not included. Instead flood protection level is based on the assumption of proportionality with national income level.

(p.4, line 18-22, 38) On the one hand: changes due to socioeconomic development are driven by population and economy. On the other hand: protection level, which is assumed proportional to national income level is kept constant over time. This is inconsistent.

(p. 6, lines 16-19) The present situation is in the paper characterized based on conditions 2010 while effects of climate change is based on projections for 2030. This time interval, 20 years, is a bit short for meaningful comparisons.

(p.8, 3 lines 5-15; Fig. 1a) While the colouring of the maps allows for different absolute impact on people and material damage for an individual city, the location of all cities are exactly the same on both people and damage maps. This latter fact seems to indicate that the relative difference in impact between cities remains almost identically the same for both people and damage.

(p.17, lines (23-38) The actual, on the ground flood management measures and other socioeconomic development are presented for Marrakech. However, in the model producing the source data for this paper only some of these factors were incorporated. See previous comment re page 4.

Technical corrections

- (p.1) The title is “.....changes on river...” should be “.....changes in river...”
- (p.7: 25) “.....Whist...” should be “.....Whilst ...”
- (Fig. 1) Fig. 1a) is difficult to read because of the many cities and the small font; however still ok. Fig. 1b) is too blurry due to combination of background colours and text. More or less impossible printed; still difficult on the screen.
- (Fig.2) Similar problems as with Fig. 1
- (Fig.3) Similar problems as with Fig. 1 &2. Difficulties reading this figure exacerbated by all the information crammed into one page. The gradients indicated along the axes are impossible to interpret.
- (p.13:1) “.....reduction on...” should be “.....reduction of ...”
- P.16:16) “.....loses...” should be “.....losses ...”