

Interactive comment on “Model cascade from meteorological drivers to river flood hazard: flood-cascade v1.0” by Peter Uhe et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 31 January 2021

As a person who has been working with all the three components featured in this paper, i.e., meteorology, hydrologic modeling, and flood inundation mapping, I am seriously confused about this flood-cascade. I thoroughly read the paper. Overall, it is very well-written. The methodology is reasonable. Yet, I think that the authors' justification of creating a flood-cascade sends a wrong message to the new-generation of readers, disavowing the long history of hydrologic-hydraulic modeling research (apologies for the use of strong words here).

After reading the abstract and introduction, a reader might think that this “flood-cascade” is a brand-new concept. But that would be wrong. In fact, the so-called flood-cascade, integrating meteorology drivers to flood hazard predictions and hence assessment of climate change impacts, has existed in our scientific community for a

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



long time with different forms, scales, and names. For example, the GLOFRIM for integrated hydrological–hydrodynamic global modelling by Hoch et al. (2017) and the National Water Model in the United States are just two examples of many existing, globally applicable flood-cascade frameworks. Each of these existing frameworks are well-resolved flood-cascades with cascading input-output structures according to the authors' definition. I hereby strongly oppose the author's narrative in the existing version of the paper.

In summary, the merit of this paper comes down to evaluation of a relatively new LIS-FLOOD modeling framework for one of the world's data-poor flood-prone basins. The paper has all the potential to getting accepted for publication, however, with major changes in the title, abstract, and introduction.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-280>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

