

Interactive comment on “Wetropolis extreme rainfall and flood demonstrator: from mathematical design to outreach and research” by Onno Bokhove et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 6 November 2019

The manuscript describes an interesting outreach prototype that allows to better understand the rainfall runoff dynamic. The topic is appealing for the community and I am glad to suggest its publication. The main issue that I would like to share with the authors concerns the organization of the manuscript.

Introduction

Page 2 – lines 15-32 and page 3 lines 1-20, although interesting are off topic.

Page 4. Too many technical details about Wetropolis for an Introduction Section. I would include here eventually similar outreach prototypes and the aim of Wetropolis. What kind of experiments can be done ? which phenomena author would like to show

C1

? Some of the info provided in the Conclusion could be added in the Intro.

Other Sections The analytical part of the paper seems in contradiction with the outreach aim. Why all these formulations are included? This should be better explained before their description otherwise could be included in the appendix. Indeed, it is not fully clear if these formulations are part of the outreach aim of they are only useful for the Wetropolis design.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-191>, 2019.