

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., community comment CC3
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-268-CC3>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Reply on CC1

Faith Chan

Community comment on "Comparison of Sustainable Flood Risk Management by four countries: the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, the United States, & Japan, and the implications for Asian coastal megacities" by Faith Ka Shun Chan et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-268-CC3>, 2021

Dear Handling Editor of NHESS, Prof Dr Animesh Gain
On behalf of all co-authors, I would like to appreciate two anonymous reviewers' responses and feedback to our manuscript, namely "Comparative analysis and implications of sustainable Flood Risk Management in four front-end countries: The United Kingdom, the Netherlands, the United States, & Japan" (Ref: NHESS-2021-268) for the journal NHESS.

I would like to respond to all suggestions/comments per se as below (start at next page). The reviewers' comments are shown in italics and my responses are shown in blue colour (see attached file).

I would like to submit the tracked version of our manuscript (Ref: NHESS-2021-268 R1) for the reviewers and editor to read our changes/revisions more explicitly.

We hope this revision will be satisfactory and grateful for the handling operation by the NHESS editorial office, the handling editor, Prof Dr Animesh Gain, and two anonymous reviewers for the feedback and comments of this revision, which is truly appreciated.

Once again, we would like to appreciate all changes and hope our revision has been addressed all issues raised by two reviewers and helped this manuscript to be improved substantially.

Reviewer 2 (R2)

Comments:

R2: This is an interesting and important paper examining the four case studies on how they cope with flooding hopefully with transferrable best practices to Asian Megacities. The paper is detailed and well written but needs to do an overall edit in terms of language and spelling accuracy. There are some terms used in this paper which needs further clarifications and evidence.

The methods are sound. Comparing and contrasting the four cases made this a very rich discussion but some sections/ statements need more evidence or clarity.

In addition, more could be devoted to the best practices that could be transferred to the Asian context- which is distinct from the chosen cases in terms of geography and political

and social structures.

Overall a good paper with a bit more work on the transferable practices and overall edit in terms of clarity and language would be make this an excellent paper to be published in the journal.

FC: Thanks for the positive comments and truly appreciated, we will address all grammatical and provide overall edits in terms of clarity and improve the language issue to make our manuscript to be better in the revised version. Thanks for the comment and truly appreciated it.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2021-268/nhess-2021-268-CC3-supplement.pdf>