
JOURNAL OF COASTAL AND RIVERINE FLOOD RISK

Review and rebuttal of the paper

Assessment and Management of Flood Hazard for Tulkarm Area in Palestine

Anayah et al.

Editor handling the paper: Miguel Esteban

The reviewers remain anonymous.

First, the authors would like to thank the associate editor and the two reviewers for the time and effort made available to review and comment on the manuscript. The comments are constructive and helpful to better demonstrate the concepts of the study and the interpretation of the results. Second, all comments were addressed as needed and changes were made using the “Track Change” function for an easy revision to the edited manuscript. Third, a general review to the manuscript text was conducted to improve its readability and quality of writing as shown in the revised manuscript.

ROUND 1

Reviewer A

Major comments:

1. There is no novelty in using the AHP method with GIS for flood risk mapping, and the eight selected factors (slope, elevation, etc.) are commonly used in flood risk assessments. I suggest considering some special parameters that reflect local characteristics for flood risk assessment, like the unique political, economic, and resource constraints in Palestine.

Authors: Fixed. (lines 24-31 page 2, lines 17-48 page 3, lines 1-2 page 4, Section 4.2 lines 32-35 page 14, lines 1-26 page 15, and Figure 6 lines 2-19 page 14).

2. Figure 3 suffers from poor quality and readability issues. The flow accumulation map in Figure 3 is particularly unclear.

Authors: Fixed (lines 1-2 page 11).

3. Section 4.3 presents some flood hazard management strategies that have not been validated and do not take into account characteristics. These measures ignore Palestine's specific political and economic constraints, making many proposals unrealistic. Authors should propose context-specific interventions based on local conditions and validate their effectiveness through pilot studies or expert consultations

Authors: Fixed (Table 3 lines 7-8 page 16).

Recommendation: Revisions Required

Authors: The manuscript had been generally reviewed to improve its readability and quality.

Reviewer C

This study carried out assessment and management study of flood hazard for Tulkarm Area in Palestine. This is an interesting work, which provides guiding significance for flood risk management in the region. However, the manuscript still should be improved before publication, such as introduction, data description and discussion. Therefore, I suggest a minor revision for this manuscript. And I give some suggestions which I hope useful to the author.

1. The introduction needs to be further improved. It is recommended to add the latest foreign research papers, especially on assessment and management of flood hazard in recent years. It is necessary to clearly explain what problems exist in existing research and clarify the innovation points, so that readers can see the advantages of this paper.

Authors: Fixed (lines 5-11 page 2, lines 24-49 page 2, lines 4-48 page 3, lines 1-2 page 4).

2. As mentioned by the authors in the cover letter, data is a major highlight of this paper. The specific time of underlying surface, rainfall, runoff and other data needs to be provided, which is related to the applicability of research conclusions at present. Suggest adding a description of the data before "3 Methods".

Authors: Fixed (lines 18-24 page 6).

3. I suggest merging 4.1 and 4.2, both of which focus on hazard assessment. And it is recommended to provide the verification results described in 4.2 using a spatial distribution map.

Authors: Fixed (lines 12-18 page 13 and Figure 6 lines 2-19 page 14).

4. Climate change is indeed an important factor affecting flood risk, but the discussion in this paper is temporarily limited to the summary of the IPCC report. It is recommended to summarize it as a discussion or outlook at the end.

Authors: Fixed (lines 4-23 page 3, lines 14-23 page 18, lines 24-26 page 18, lines 29-31 page 18, line 33 page 18, lines 35-36 page 18, lines 40-41 page 18, lines 2-3 page 19, and lines 18-20 page 19).

ROUND 2

Reviewer A:
Recommendation: See Comments

The paper is written clearly using correct grammar and syntax:

could be better

Authors: A general language revision had been conducted from A to Z in the first revision to the manuscript. Each and every single sentence had been visited and corrected, if needed.

Distinct novel aspects are treated in the paper, which are clearly indicated in the abstract:

yes

Authors: Thanks.

The references are relevant and well-formatted in author-date style, with added URLs if available:

yes

Authors: Thanks.

The paper is to the point and concise:

The introduction is too long and unfocused; it reads more like a literature review than an introduction. The authors should condense it by at least half and get to the point more quickly about what specific problem they're solving.

Authors: In the first revision round, Reviewer C had asked to improve the introduction and add the latest foreign research papers. This is why the introduction became longer and included several studies from the literature.

The introduction is fixed (see Page 2 lines 10-15, 19-21, 25-26, 30-31, 34-35, 40-41, 42-44, 48-50, Page 3 lines 1-8, 14-15, 22-23, 26-27, 29-30, 40-42, and Page 4 line 1).

All illustrations and tables are useful and of good quality and are placed in the text where referred to:

[Authors: Thanks.](#)

Reviewer B:

The authors have addressed each point I raised. I recommend acceptance.

Recommendation: Accept Submission

[Authors: Thanks.](#)
