# McDonald

L28: Add reference (Macdonald and Sangster, 2017): OK ADD TO BIBLIOGRAPHY

L60: Change “riparian populations” 🡪 “**populations living adjacent to the river**, etc.”: OK

L78: “testing the” 🡪 “testing **of** the” & “real-life dataset” 🡪 “real-**world** dataset”: OK “This allows testing of the FFA models” formulation bizarre?

L128: “In some cases, the flood inventory starts before the date t1 of the first known flood (for instance, at the creation of the service in charge of surveying floods, or at the date of bridge construction where historical data is available).”

🡪 I think this is valid if we know that the bridge replaced a previous bridge lost to a flood: Why? This doesn’t affect the fact that all the floods are supposed to be recorded since the creation of the bridge. however, if this is not the case, the bridge may significantly alter the flood levels/channel morphology and /or over-estimate the period of time at the start of the historical record if construction occurred much earlier than the first historical account.: I agree about the channel morphology modification, but as this morphology remains stable during the whole surveying period (e.g. the whole life of the bridge), that may not be a problem. There is no over-estimation of the period if the floods are recorded since the construction of the bridge.

# Hooker

L1: Remove “more” in the title: OK

L8: “Censored nature” 🡪 Plain English: ???

L8: Remove “Indeed”: OK

L75: “I’m intrigued to know how?” How what? How are uncertainties determined? (“with discharge uncertainties carefully determined by Lucas et al. (2023)”)

L87: Rephrase or remove “with a collection of historical floods” 🡪 “of **censored** historical floods”: OK

L96: Align equation to the left & add a full stop: OK

L140: Make a table for the different models: OK TO DO

L163: “On the other hand” over-used in the paper 🡪 **However**: OK VOIR AUTRES OCCURENCES

L165: “On the other hand” 🡪 Removed

L290

L307

L390

L196: “After the building of the Vallabrègues Dam in 1967, the station was moved 2 km downstream”; I assume the dam did not impact the river discharge? Might be worthwhile clarifying this.

“After the building of the Vallabrègues Dam in 1967, the station was moved 2 km downstream and is still in the same place today. There is no tributary between the previous and the current station.” 🡪

This point has been developed in the following paragraph. You can also find a more detailed explanation in Lucas et al. (2023) cited in the next sentence in the article.

“**The gauging station has been used until the construction of the Vallabrègues hydroelectric scheme in 1967, which led to the derivation of a part of the discharge. Consequently, a new gauging station was installed 2 km downstream from the restitution of the derivated discharges. This new station has been used ever since. We assume that there is no impact of the Vallabrègues Dam on the discharge at the station only during floods.**”

L246: Change to a colourblind friendly palette: OK TO DO

L249: Improve plot resolution: OK TO DO

L260: “AMAX long” 🡪 **Amax short**: OK

L263: “details” 🡪 **detail**: Ok

L267: “A poor” 🡪 **Poor**: Ok

L269: Remove full stop: Ok

L269: Correct figure caption: Ok

L282: Remove “simply”: Ok

L286: “a lesser” 🡪 less: Ok

L287: “a poor” 🡪 poor: Ok

L300: remove correlation figure? TO DO

L303: “number k of times” 🡪 number of times k: Ok

L315: It would be helpful to remind the reader and overview the aims of Section 5 here: TO DO

L320: add commas: OK

L321: "arbitrarly” 🡪 arbitrarily: OK

L348-49: “poorly knowing” 🡪 poor knowledge of: OK

L352: Correct figure caption: OK

L371: Correct figure caption: OK

L375: “the elicitation of more informative priors” i.e. determining more precise priors based on expert knowledge or other data sources. See for example: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2112.07090>

L386: “poorly knowing” 🡪 limited knowledge of: Ok

L387-8: remove “a”: Ok

L388: “for” italic: Ok

L389: “the determination of the” 🡪 determining the: OK

L397: remove “an” and add allow “us”: Ok

L421: “explicitely” 🡪 explicitly: Ok

L440: rephrase TO DO

L454: Any further recommendations for FFA using historical observations in practice? How is knowledge of uncertainties useful? Some relation back to the wider flood risk picture would round off the article nicely: OK TO DO