

Authors responses to reviewer 2 comments

Reviewer 2 comments	Authors response
	<p>We would like to thank both of our anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions. We have provided our response and carefully addressed the issues raised by the reviewers.</p>
<p>1. The manuscript on 'Inclusiveness in designing early warning system for flood resilience' by Yasmin et al is interesting. However, still the message of the short communication is not clear to me. I would suggest major revision taking into account the following comments: 1) The authors should provide a clear description how the SMART approach resolves existing limitations of flood warning system.</p>	<p>We have now revised figure 2 and rewritten section 4 in page 6 (line 262-279).</p> <p>We highlight crucial steps for multi-disciplinary team (disaster risk manager, hydrologist, engineer, and social scientist) to follow when exploring risk architectures and planning response actions (Figure 2). These include Firstly, S representing 'Shared understanding of the risks' providing a scope for including diverse stakeholder engagements (irrespective to their gender, sex, age, socio-economic status and physical abilities) in different data collection as stated in step-1 (Figure 1). This knowledge generated from the community will help the expert group to better understand context specific risks with more focused portfolio to map out risks' factors through exposure and vulnerability analysis. This further helps to identify common goals and anticipate damage from the natural hazards. Secondly, M representing 'Monitoring of the risks' aligned closely with establishing alert system and forecasting hazard information as stated in step-2 (Figure 1). This includes an intersection of generated knowledge that will lead towards practicing collaborative activities, such as through knowledge co-production and collaboration (i.e., trust-building, exchanging critical risk information, providing feedbacks, forming small groups for maintaining forecasting system. Thirdly, A as in building Awareness (i.e., training and capacity development activities, understanding weather and alert information in real time) is critical for this approach and is a continuous process throughout the development and utilisation of early warning system. Finally, RT indicating and pre-planning Response actions on Time (i.e., comprehensive disaster management plan, evacuation plan) is crucial to minimize risks from the anticipated damages from the hazard information and will inform the existing community and responsible agencies to take effective action.</p>
<p>2) The authors should provide evidences and examples of the application of SMART approach.</p>	<p>In paper we propose SMART approach as a way to answer the questions that we have raised by reviewing each EWS steps that developed from reviewing flood early warning related literature.</p> <p>This article seeks to outline the concept of the SMART approach as a brief communication. It is not a data paper and therefore giving examples seems beyond the scope of this article type. We make reference to the literature by way of evidencing approaches throughout the manuscript.</p>