

Responses to comments on egusphere -2025-6376

<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-6376>

“Learning from the past to inform flood risk management: Analysis of public survey data in Belgium on flood early warning and response during the July 2021 flood”

Heather J. Murdock, Daniela Rodriguez Castro, Benjamin Dewals, Anna Heidenreich, and Annegret H. Thieken (Submitted 19 Dec 2025)

Thank you for your review. In the text below we provide a point-by-point response to the comments made. For clarity we have organized the comments and responses into tables with comments on the left and responses on the right in italic for clarity.

Referee 1 – Anna Goodden (Referee)

<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-6376-RC1>

Referee Comments

Comments	Responses
<p>‘Learning from the past to inform flood risk management’ surveyed 550 residents in Belgium to assess the flood warning system in Walloon in response to the major floods in July 2021. Overall, this was a really enjoyable read and a well thought through study! The description of your methods were really clear, and your study made coherent sense.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comment and for valuing our work.</i></p>
<p>The framing could be slightly adjusted in Section 1. The introduction and background explains the PADM model and WMO four pillar framework for early warning systems. But, I think the PADM model (and the significance) of it could have been explained more, as at times it seemed like the paper was going in the direction of focusing on the WMO rather than PADM. This could be addressed by adding a few sentences of why PADM matters before explaining the components of it, and then elaborating further about other studies that have used it, and how/why it’s helpful to understand people’s responses to hazards. You could also reference the WMO more throughout the paper, to keep that link going throughout.</p>	<p><i>The PADM Model is currently introduced in the introduction and background (Section 1) with references to other applications of the model and it’s suitability for this study. We use PADM as the theoretical basis for the analysis.</i></p> <p><i>The WMO four pillar framework is mostly used for the background on the warning system in Belgium so that all aspects of the warning chain are explained in a structured way.</i></p> <p><i>In Section 1 we will add some sentences about the significance of PADM as a widely used framework in disaster risk reduction. In addition, in Section 1.2 we will add some sentences linking the WMO MHEWS framework and PADM more explicitly. The aim here is to more clearly demonstrate why we reference both frameworks in this paper.</i></p> <p><i>We will link the framing of the conclusion to the WMO MHEWS four pillars, and specifically point out where the insights from our study could</i></p>

	<p><i>support improved warning and response chains to achieve early warnings for all. However, it would not make sense to reference the four pillar framework throughout the analysis and discussion because it doesn't play a strong role in terms of the theoretical basis of this research.</i></p>
<p>Similar to this, Figure 3 is great! And should be in the results rather than the conclusion, as it is presenting what the paper has found. I also think this can be used to draw in the PADM model literature referenced in Section 1, and why all this theory matters for your results. Because PADM itself was not mentioned much in your results, I think having a final results paragraph linking all your results together and to the wider PADM literature would be helpful to tie everything together.</p>	<p><i>We will add a summary section to the results and include the figure there. This will be Section 3.5 Summary and PADM and in this section we will more strongly connect our findings to the PADM model and why the theory matters for the results as suggested. In the conclusion, we will then only refer to the figure.</i></p>
<p>The policy recommendations of the paper for future Belgium flood policies could be clearer throughout Section 4. You use the phrase 'probably help' on line 634, which could be tweaked to be more decisive on how (and if) flood hazard maps can impact responses to flood events.</p>	<p><i>We intentionally approach the policy recommendations cautiously as any recommendations made should only be based on results of our analyses. That said we will strengthen this aspect and also more clearly state the limitations of this study and the possible policy recommendations. We will also mention some suggestions for future research that could support policy recommendations.</i></p>
<p>Minor referencing error on line 227, where the references are not merged into one list and in the PDF pre-print it says 'Click or tap here to enter text'.</p>	<p><i>Thank you for this comment, we will correct this.</i></p>
<p>Some more small referencing errors on lines 394/5, 489, and 529/30.</p>	<p><i>This will also be corrected.</i></p>
<p>The research questions were very clear, and made Section 3 clear and very easy to follow. Though, sub-sections would benefit from another layer of numbering (e.g 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.2.1), as occasionally I lost track of which specific section I was reading.</p>	<p><i>Three levels of numbering are allowed by NHESS and so we will add a third level as suggested.</i> <i>Thank you again for your comments.</i></p>