

Interactive comment on “Citizen observations contributing to flood modelling: opportunities and challenges” by Thaine Herman Assumpção et al.

M. Moy de Vitry

matthew.moydevitry@eawag.ch

Received and published: 6 October 2017

The review of how citizen observations have been used in flood modelling research is useful and very timely. The main value of the review is in mapping out the different case studies, identifying trends, and pointing out research gaps. Minor revisions are recommended:

.

Page 1 line 27:

- Do the authors refer to the general need for data in modelling, or specifically to monitoring data used for calibrating the models?

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



- The example in the second sentence "This is especially true.." requires some explanation.

.

Page 3 line 26:

- Effort is made to present two classification systems. However, these classifications are not used in sections 2 and 3.

.

Page 4 line 10:

- It is unclear why geo-tagged information is not explicitly geographic.

.

Page 4 lines 15-20:

- It does not seem appropriate that SCENT is given a prominent position in this review paper, which should review published literature and not ongoing projects.

.

Page 5 Figure 2:

- Fig 2 illustrates nicely how specific examples are classified within Craglia et al.'s definition, and therefore more examples would be beneficial. It would be even better if the examples were taken from literature.

- SCENT should be removed from the figure.

- it is unclear why the CAPTCHAs are neither implicit nor explicit

.

Page 6, lines 1-2:

- Have studies such as Merkurjeva et al. (2015) been included in the review? please specify.

- The citation is not necessary

.

Page 6, line 18-20:

- It is unclear why the text example is provided in the same paragraph as the images/videos and not in the previous paragraph.

.

Page 7, Table 1:

- It would be good to split the column 'case study' into two columns 'location' and 'flooding type'

- What ordering is used in the table? publication year might make sense.

.

Page 12, Figure 3:

- The review extends to April 2017 - has the publication count for the year 2017 been normalized?

.

Page 13, line 7:

- Flickr and Picasa are products, it is better to refer to photo sharing services.

- what is exactly meant with 'mining', and how does that entail low-quality data?

.

Page 18, lines 19-25:

- The discussion on reliability and volume of data is interesting and necessary, but the statements do not seem to make good of the review that was conducted. Do none of the papers attempt to quantify uncertainty?

- Is the volume of data per type (water level, velocity, etc.) available comparable to the number of case studies?

.

Page 19, lines 20-26:

- The language used is imprecise.

- "interactions between citizen science and water resources"

- "Deal with uncertainty"

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-456>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

