JOURNAL OF COASTAL AND RIVERINE FLOOD RISK

Review and rebuttal of the paper

# Reflections on Katrina: 20 years down the road

C. E. Colten

Editor handling the paper: Jeremy Bricker

The reviewers remain anonymous.

# Review Round 1

## Reviewer A:

Some major concerns with the paper: I would urge the author to rethink the order of the paragraphs and to provide more
internal structure. As is, the paper feels a bit chaotic - especially because the reader does not know what to expect. [edits made throughout to both provide guide posts and to provide thematic links] It might make sense to use more chapter headings or to have an actual introduction, in which the author could outline their perspective and main arguments. [Revised abstract to offer clearer guidance to reader and added section headers]

In the abstract the author mentions lessons learned & unlearned. I would like to see more engagement with this theme throughout the paper. Are the lessons learned/unlearned with regards to the resilience of the city or are these general lessons for disaster recovery? I'm especially curious about the lessons unlearned, which unfortunately the author does not really engage with throughout the text. [added text defining lessons learned and lost and clearly identified lessons learned and lost]

Please provide some background on the authors positionality - they say that they have been there (in Baton Rouge) - why and in what capacity? Why did they speak to so many reporters, especially when they hadn't even been in the city themselves? Let the reader know that this is a subjective observation piece from the beginning [text added p. 2 lines re positionality 7-9] to address positionality - I was a bit surprised when the tone changed on page 2 and the 1st person was suddenly used.

Some additional minor concerns about the paper:
" The paper would benefit from a more substantial abstract. [revised and expanded abstract]

" There is still a number of typos, double-spaces, etc. that need to be fixed.[edited text throughout]

" Page 1, Line 17: delivered greatly diminished winds - this phrase does not make sense. - revised to indicate diminished from peak speeds over the Gulf

" Page 1, Line 20f: The protection system was certainly not massive and it had not been updated for years before the storm hit. - Unchanged: it was massive by US standards and had been under construction/improvement since 1965 (incomplete in 2005) See Colten 2009 - clarified in revisions

" Page 1, Line 33: end of quote - quotation marks are missing. corrected

" Page 2, Line 13: choose instead of chose corrected

" Page 2, Line 36: latter half revised to clarify

" Page 3 Line 28f: phrase does not make sense. - revised to improve clarity

" Page 3, Line 45: damaged - revised line 45 - word damage was not in that line

Many thanks for providing me with the opportunity to read this manuscript. I would advise some major structural revisions to make it easier for the reader to follow. Additionally, the paper needs to be carefully edited before it can go to publication.
Recommendation: Revisions Required

## Reviewer B

The topic is of high interest to the journal and in fact is a special issue topic. From the perspective of a historical geographer, the author explores novel aspects in his paper by investigating the relationships among coastal society in New Orleans, rising sea levels and disastrous events, and the cultural landscape itself. He addresses fundamental questions about how New Orleans society has made decisions regarding which forms of protection they value, what deserves efforts to protect or preserve, and why. The novelty of the paper is well supported by a thorough literature review.

# Review Round 2

**Reviewer A:**

The paper has improved immensly. Thank you for giving me another opportunity to review this piece. I'd suggest the author make the focus on urban resilience a bit more prevalent, as it is not just any kind of resilence they are talking about. In fact, resilience as a concept used in this essay is about community resilience and not just urban resilience. The research underlying this essay considered community resilience.

I have inserted passages to try to bring this out in the revisions.

There are only a few minor grammar/spelling/punctuation mistakes that need fixing before publication:
p.1, l.26: a storm surge [correct as used]
p. 2, l. 5: comma after warning [comma added]
p. 2, l. 9: comma after inland -- delete repetition of inland [changes made]
p. 2, l. 16: delete the [corrected]
p. 2, l. 19: was shaped [corrected]
p. 2, l. 41: move in the United States to the beginning of the sentence [moved]
p. 2, final paragraph: this paragraph is a bit confusing as it jumps between past and present tense [revised for tense]
p. 3, l. 13: to protect [corrected]
p. 3, l. 22: as lessons lost [corrected]
p. 3, l. 42: Hurricane Isaac [corrected]
p. 3, l. 45: created [word not in line 45?]
p. 4, l. 5: rephrase and avoid to switch from past to present mid-sentence. [corrected]
p. 4, l. 33: in the form of levee [corrected]