

Interactive comment on “EUFF (EUropean Flood Fatalities): A European flood fatalities database since 1980” by Olga Petrucci et al.

Jonathan Gourley (Referee)

jj.gourley@noaa.gov

Received and published: 18 November 2020

Reviewer Summary:

This article describes a flood fatality database available for 8 European countries for a time period from 1980-2018. The database includes a number of variables that can be pieced together to help describe the specific circumstances surrounding each fatality event. Many of the details were extracted by newspaper reports and thus requires a great deal of manual work to ascertain the details. The database is thus quite useful for research purposes and practical applications. I was able to successfully download the database and could interpret the variables quite easily. I did note that the file was described as csv, or comma-delimited, but the fields were delimited by semi-colons.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Anyhow, not a big deal, but there are some major points that need to be addressed prior to publication. I highlight these below.

1. Novelty of the manuscript - The EUFF 2020 database is an update to the EUFF 2019 one that was described in Petrucci et al. (2019). EUFF 2020 provides more data from prior events and includes more geographic regions, totaling 17 new flood fatalities. I note that this is still far from including the total land area of Europe. Nevertheless, the information presented in the new article is very similar to that of Petrucci et al. (2019), the latter of which uses more figures than data in tables presented in the current article. I preferred the presentation of the data in the form of figures as shown in Petrucci et al. (2019). But, I see very similar data being used in both articles. I note that the authors address this potential shortcoming by stating that the new paper includes a trend analysis of the fatalities, broken down into age and gender categories. The issue I see with this is they are already working with a small sample size of data. Once it's further segregated by country, year, age, gender, etc., then it gets even smaller. I'm not comfortable with fitting lines to the small samples of data to ascertain if there is a significant trend. I don't have as much experience reviewing articles describing databases, but if this were a "normal" manuscript, then I would not consider this to be novel enough for a stand-alone publication. Nevertheless, this is more of a decision for the topical editor.

2. Presentation quality - I would strongly suggest that the authors improve the general readability of the manuscript. I began making notes about improper grammar beginning with the first sentence in the abstract. I quit making notes on the grammar because they were quite numerous. I also note that the presentation of the article text comes across more as an outline or draft rather than a manuscript in final form. There are lots of paragraphs containing a single sentence, improper indenting, and use of boldface in the text as one might do in a proposal, etc.. I would expect this for materials that are being presented orally, but not in a written, published format.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-154>, 2020.

ESSDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

