

Interactive comment on “DamaGIS: a multisource geodatabase for collection of flood-related damage data” by Clotilde Saint-Martin et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 27 March 2018

The proposed manuscript intends to introduce a multisource geodatabase of flood-related damage data: DamaGIS. At this stage, the geodatabase, which can be fully assessed and download to any computer, comprises flood-related damage data for the south of France. The manuscript first describes the state-of-the-art of flood-related damage databases in Europe and parts of the world, then introduces the DamaGIS database (the proposed database), highlighting the database structure and classification scheme. After this, an analysis of the data already compiled is performed, highlighting a particular flood event. The paper concludes with an overview of the database benefits, limitations and future perspective. The manuscript is written in a fluent English with the presence of minor misspellings, but a careful analysis of how references are cited should be performed, because there are inconsistent citation

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



models, and some cited references are absent from the reference list (Some examples are highlighted in the supplement file). The number and quality of the provided references is appropriate. Nevertheless, I have some specific comments about the geodatabase that should be addressed before publication: 1) DamaGis is introduced as a “work in progress”, allowing the user to add and update information. Given this, a clear outline as how this can be done should be presented in the manuscript. At this stage the database can be downloaded by anyone, and how will different suppliers contribute to the database? How to ensure data consistency between different contributors? How local/national authorities can contribute? 2) I don’t understand the need to incorporate the Basin feature class. These features are clearly related to a specific area, which in this case is the south of France, and the information is independent of the flood-related damage. Furthermore, other types of information, which include other related hydrology objects, may be of relevance to the user, but it should be up to the user to provide them and then cross that information with DamaGiS data. 3) Page 7, line 24: I could not find in any GIS layer with a DETAIL field. 4) Types and subtypes of damages should be clarified. For example, sub-type Tow hall belongs to type Crisis management, but shouldn’t belong to Government services, administration type? There are no sub-types for the Water network or Housing types, why? 5) Also related to the previous point, Table 1 should present different sub-types belonging to the same type separated by commas, or semicolon, otherwise is confusing to the reader. 6) The rating system for the severity of the damage is very interesting and constituted the highlight of this manuscript. This should be emphasized not only when presenting the methodology rating, but also in the abstract, for this is what sets apart the DamaGIS database and allows kit to be used for/on other parts of the world. 7) The definition of event should be provided. This is particular useful when presenting the 2015 flood event. Some other minor comments are imbedded on the supplementary file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.earth-syst-sci-data-discuss.net/essd-2018-28/essd-2018-28-RC3->

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2018-28>, 2018.

ESSDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

