

# ***Interactive comment on “CLIMADA v1.4.1: Towards a globally consistent adaptation options appraisal tool” by David N. Bresch and Gabriela Aznar-Siguan***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 18 September 2020

The authors intend to introduce a methodology that integrate climate modelled risk, impacts (loss and damage), and adaptation options assessment (cost/benefit analysis). In addition, they provide a case study in Antilles to demonstrate an example to use the tool. The intentions are valuable and the platform seems useful to scientists and decision makers at local levels. However, the authors fail to present their intentions and execution well enough for readers to comprehend the value of this study. Here are my comments to this paper:

1. The paper is difficult to read because of a lot of grammar issues. It is perhaps better to proofread the entire text in the next revision.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



2. Section 1 (Introduction): This section is mixed with problem statement and literature review, which make this section confusing. Unfortunately, both (problem statement and theoretical background) are not presented clearly. What's the problem now? What's the scientific gap now? What does this study aim to achieve? These questions can help readers to get to know the reasons behind this study. In addition, a lot of reviewed literature are citing the authors' previous work and stating the content of the reviewed papers. It lacks of discussion of the problems of current practices from reviewing literature.

3. Section 2 (Framework Concept and Design): This section provides a lot of technical details of CLIMADA. It is useful to add some important perspectives. For example, can CLIMADA be used in every climate impacts? The paper uses Hurricane as an example risk, but can other impacts (e.g., agriculture, health, etc.) be used in the platform? Is there a constrain in this tool? Such as data availability? In addition, why a moderate scenario is selected? Since the authors are exploring a hazard/disaster impact, why not use the worst case scenario (RCP 8.5)?

4. Section 3 (Case Study): It is perhaps helpful if the authors can provide some background information of current response measures of Antilles in facing Hurricane hazards. In addition, one key challenge of climate modeling in island nation is the resolution and hurricane projection. Did you conduct downscaling? How did you project hurricanes in 2050?

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-151>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)