

Interactive comment on “Should seasonal rainfall forecasts be used for flood preparedness?” by Erin Coughlan de Perez et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 13 April 2017

General comments:

The paper questions whether seasonal rainfall information can be used to indicate the likelihood of flooding within a season, focusing on sub-Saharan Africa. In particular the paper focuses on correlations between different seasonal rainfall variables (e.g. total seasonal rainfall, mean rainfall intensity and cumulative wet days) and “floodiness” determined through using a reanalysis dataset to drive a global hydrological model. The authors conclude that forecasts of seasonal total rainfall may be less informative than other more granular metrics, providing further motivation for studies to understand what seasonal forecast variables can best inform disaster management and humanitarian decisions.

This paper provides a concise and interesting research contribution on an important

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



topic with implications for disaster risk management and the design of seasonal climate services. It is well written, focused, and provides a balanced interpretation of the evidence provided through analysing reanalysis and hydrological model datasets. The paper will be of interest to those who are involved developing climate services, particularly using seasonal forecasts, humanitarian agencies, government decision makers addressing flood risks, and the climate scientists advancing methods for relating long-term rainfall patterns to the risk of flooding events. This paper will provide a valuable contribution to the literature.

Below are some relatively minor recommended changes that should help further improve the paper, focusing on refining some of the key arguments and explanation of the results.

Specific comments:

1) Abstract, line beginning “Results demonstrate...”: the evidence of “little to no indication...” is not necessarily true of all wet climate regions in the study area and is perhaps an over-generalisation. Suggest rephrasing – i.e. some regions of west, central and east Africa with typically wet climates.

2) The term “flood-generating process” is used throughout the paper (e.g. in section 4) when referring to measures of seasonal rainfall and their correlations to “floodiness”. I am not sure the terminology is entirely appropriate since the measures evaluated in this paper are statistical indicators/quantities as opposed to physical processes (e.g. convective or frontal rainfall). Consider revising this terminology to something less associated with processes – e.g. “Total seasonal rainfall is not a reliable indicator of the intensity of flood events within a season in most river basins...”.

3) Last sentence of section 2.1: The horizontal resolutions of seasonal forecasting systems from global producing centres have increased substantially in recent years, and many operational systems now run at 0.5 degrees and sometimes as high as 0.25 degrees. The justification of using a 2.5 degree resolution therefore needs to be

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



revised, with reference to more recent literature (a paper from 2003 is currently cited).

4) Section 3, second sentence: In addition to West and Central Africa, from viewing the figures I would add the Greater Horn of Africa region in East Africa as a region where the relationship appears weak. The reference to West and Central Africa is mentioned in other places in the paper so check the consistency in the rest of the paper after making any revisions.

5) Section 4, second sentence: Insert “understanding of” before the word “predictability”. The point being that predictability comes from the accuracy of the forecast models used to predict seasonal rainfall and not the quality of the reanalysis data per se.

6) Section 4, paragraph 2: The reference to Koppen climate classifications is first made here. Whilst I can see the value in linking the relationships between seasonal rainfall metrics and floodiness to different climate types, there is a risk of over-generalising the results. The climate types within East Africa and southern Africa (and elsewhere) vary greatly so to generalise by saying these regions are classified as “arid” is misleading – some areas are far from arid – and further using this as a basis to generalise the results of the study risks over-simplifying the findings. Understanding the robustness of these findings for different climate types would require further investigation.

Technical corrections:

- 1) Section 1, second paragraph, final sentence needs rephrasing to improve clarity.
- 2) Suggest inserting “many parts of” between “for” and “Africa” in first sentence of section 2.
- 3) Is the third predictor variable definitely at the 75th percentile? The results do seem consistent with this but just checking as the 1 day variable is 95th and 99th percentile whilst 3 day is 75th and 99th.
- 4) “Floodiness” is first defined in section 2.2 but used earlier in the paper. Either define this term earlier or state that it will be defined in section 2.2 when first introduced.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



- 5) Section 2.2: I think it would be helpful to know approximately how many river pixels typically can be found within 2.5 degree gridbox. This would help in interpreting the “floodiness” metric when used throughout the paper.
- 6) Section 2.4, third paragraph – acronym GLM needs introducing earlier (not in section 3).
- 7) Section 3, fifth paragraph, consider rephrasing second sentence beginning “Figure 4a” to replace “not more strongly” – this is a little confusing.
- 8) The figures would benefit from latitude and longitude values on the axes.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2017-40, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

