Dear editor,

I went through the revised version of the paper entitled "Citizen observations contributing to flood modelling: opportunities and challenges" by Assumpcao et al. The manuscript has improved greatly. The area of the weak assessment that I had indicated in the original submission has now been elaborated. However, the point that I also had made on climate change, for example, how rainfall episodes would be inferred by information gathered from the citizen science would have been useful to explore. The reason is: both fluvial and pluvial floods have severe inputs on downstream landscapes that are also largely associated with upstream modifications of flow regimes due to the variation in precipitations. I understand that there may not have such publications available, but this information would be important to draw the role of citizen science in flood management aspect.

Other minor comments

Page 1 Line 20-21. Awkward sentence

Page 2 Line 7-9. Provide references

Page 3 Line 5-21. Can be the Method section

Page 3-4 Section 1.1. Can also fit in Introduction, the list of references can be summarised as short description of citizen science

Page 5 Line 9-11. Too many 'explicitly' worlds

Page 5 Line 13. 'Water level' and 'velocity' could be used with better phrases such as 'flood water level or flood inundation' and 'flow rate'

Page 11 Line 3. 'roughness' clarify further

Page 12 Line 11-12. No publications in the use of drone?

Page 16 Line 4-20. No references provided

Line 17 Fig. 7. Adopted from?

Page 19 Line 25-26. Hydrological models vs Hydrodynamic models? better clarify wherever needed

Page 21 Line 16. 'the exact number of what'?

Page 23. In the conclusions/recommendations section, it would also be worth mentioning that the studies of this kind would reciprocally benefit/aware the citizens to get involved so that the data collected would be better quality and subsequently improved simulation and modelling of floods.