

1. **Title:** The title is brief and succinct, but several delegates felt it did not reflect what the abstract conveyed as the main objective; the main objective seemed to be to review current forecasting systems in Nepal. In this way, the word “communicating” in the title is misleading. Others suggested that it would be useful if the title indicated what type of warning the paper is considering. Is it weather related for example?

Title changed to:

Communicating complex forecasts: An analysis of the approach in Nepal’s Flood Early Warning System

2. **Need and relevance:** The group thought that the relevance was clear, however there was a general feeling that this part of the abstract was too long. The authors spend too much time talking about early warning systems. If the paper is about complex systems then this should have more space. What are the barriers and challenges that are mentioned? At least one example would be nice.

The following sentences on EWS have been deleted:

“Simple early warning systems rely on real-time data and deterministic models to generate evacuation warnings; these simple deterministic models enable life-saving action, but provide limited lead time for resilience-building early action. More complex early warning systems supported by forecasts, including probabilistic forecasts, can provide additional lead time for preparation.”

The following sentence has been edited:

“However, barriers and challenges remain in disseminating and communicating early warning information to institutional decision-makers, community members and individuals at risk, including unequal access, insufficient understanding, and inability to act on warning information”

3. **Hypothesis/Objectives:** It seems like the paper is about the benefits of complex systems over simple systems. However, the authors review the systems that already exist. This review is actually the main objective of the paper and needs to be clearer. If the hypothesis is made clearer in the abstract, then it will also be easier to link it more concretely to the title.

With the removal of the sentences focusing on simple and complex EWS differences, the abstract now reads more about the review of the current FEWS in Nepal. One sentence has been slightly edited to clarify the current system uses both simple and complex flood forecasts:

“The research reviewed the availability and utilisation of simple and complex flood forecasts in Nepal....”

4. **Methods:** The authors explain why they need this review but lack details about what they do. What does “review” and “analyse” actually mean in this case? The authors also measure impacts, but what type of impacts are they referring to? Also in this part of the abstract the authors use parentheses, which the delegates felt unnecessary.

The following sentence has been added:

“Data was collected from key informant interviews, community-level questionnaires and a national stakeholder workshop and qualitatively analysed.”

Parentheses removed.

- 5. Results/conclusions: Some indication of the results and conclusions are lacking at present. We recommend that the authors include something about this to entice the reader onwards. Some delegates would also have liked to see a short commentary of future research, but more importantly a strong take-home message at the end.**

Sentence added to end:

“Results suggest that as Nepal continues to advance in hydro-meteorological forecasting capabilities, efforts are simultaneously needed to ensure these forecasts are more effectively communicated and disseminated.”

- 6. Writing: In general the writing is good, and kudos for using the semi-colon correctly. However, several delegates commented on the long sentences that should be reduced and the extensive use of the passive voice. The example of “research was undertaken” was brought up. Also unless you have someone called “Research” in your team, you should avoid writing “research reviewed”. As the recommendations for abstracts in Geoscience Communication state, you should also avoid using acronyms. You use “DHM” here and never refer to it again. That’s a sure sign that you don’t need it in the abstract. The delegates thought “SMS” was ok to use as it is so embedded in modern culture. The authors also use some heavy words like “utilize” which they can simplify with “use”. This is much more accessible.**

Authors have checked the manuscript for the writing style changes suggested by the reviewers and made some small edits.

- 7. All in all, this is a nice abstract, but some of the elements need to be cut down and focused in order to leave space for other important aspects like results, conclusion and a take home message.**

See edits 1-6.