

My Submissions

AgeoS2020

Conference

News

EasyChair


AgeoS2020 Submission 14

Submission information updates are disabled.

For all questions related to processing your submission you should contact the conference organizers. [Click here to see information about this conference.](#)

All **reviews sent to you** can be found at the bottom of this page.

Submission 14

Title	CROSS SECTION INTERVALS OF FLOOD INUNDATION MAPPING AT UNGAUGED AREA
Paper:	 (Sep 07, 14:33 GMT) (previous versions)
Author keywords	hydraulic models flood inundation map GIS DEM
EasyChair keyphrases	cross section (463), cross section interval (427), flood inundation (196), flood inundation mapping (174), flood depth (130), dem cross section (126), water depth (110), pekan kuala nerang (95), kuala nerang (87), pekan kuala (85), flood mark (80), lanjut taman jelutong (79), akasia pekan kuala (79), hec ras model (79), flood extent (70), hydraulic modelling (50), kampung padang lanjut (47), shell kuala nerang (47), flood inundation area (47), padang terap river (47), dem dataset (40), kampung padang (40), cx5 cross section interval (40), flood event (40), various cross section interval (40), opposite taman (40), shell kuala (40)
Topics	Full Manuscript (Oral Presentation)
Abstract	Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) are essential to present the continuous surface elevation and is used for flood mapping. The use of different cross-section intervals obtained from the various spatial resolution of DEMs will affect the flood depth and inundation area estimation. Therefore, a comparison study is carried out to investigate the effect of cross-section intervals on flood expansion and flood depth which is simulated using one dimensional (1D) HEC-RAS model at Padang Terap River, Malaysia. Two digital elevation models (DEMs) imageries, Interferometry Synthetic Aperture Radar (IFSAR) and Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM) are used in this study. The result was

evaluated using likelihood measures (F-statistics, root mean square error (RMSE), and mean absolute error). The findings reveal the IFSAR DEM with cross-section interval 50 m has higher F-statistics of 70% on flood inundation estimation. By proposing the methodology, flood mapping can be provided accurately by considering the error that exist in the Geographical Information System (GIS) spatial context.

Submitted

Dec 15, 00:43 GMT

Last update

Sep 03, 04:33 GMT

Authors						
first name	last name	email	country	affiliation	Web page	corresponding?
Suhaila	Hashim	suhaila.hashim@gmail.com	Malaysia	Universiti Teknologi Mara		
Ernieza Suhana	Mokhtar	erienas81@gmail.com	Malaysia	Universiti Teknologi MARA		✓
Ahmad Ikhwan	Abdul Halim	ikhwan94lim@gmail.com	Malaysia	Universiti Teknologi MARA		
Wan Mohd Naim	Wan Mohd	wmn1960@gmail.com	Malaysia	Universiti Teknologi Mara		
Nor Aizam	Adnan	nor_aizam@uitm.edu.my	Malaysia	Universiti Teknologi MARA		
Biswajeet	Pradhan	biswajeet24@gmail.com	Australia	University of Technology Sydney		

Reviews

Review 2

Assessment

- | | |
|--|---|
| <i>1. Originality and novelty</i> | 4: (good) |
| <i>2. Abstract is sufficiently informative</i> | 5: (excellent) |
| <i>3. Methodology</i> | 5: (excellent) |
| <i>4. Results</i> | 4: (good) |
| <i>5. Discussion & Conclusion</i> | 4: (good) |
| <i>6. Figure and Tables</i> | <p>3: (fair)</p> <p>Figure 5, 6:
The source of the image should not be placed on the image. Its crowded and disturbing the inundation line. Move to the bottom of the figure's caption.</p> <p>Is a 'Opposite Taman Akasia' is a place name?</p> |
| <i>7. Significance of the study</i> | 4: (good) |

8. <i>Scientific Soundness</i>	5: (excellent)
9. <i>Language quality</i>	4: (good)
10. <i>Comments to Authors</i>	The overall written paper is easy to understand and was well explained. The contribution is clear and significant.

Review 3
Assessment

1. <i>Originality and novelty</i>	4: (good)
2. <i>Abstract is sufficiently informative</i>	4: (good)
3. <i>Methodology</i>	4: (good)
4. <i>Results</i>	4: (good)
5. <i>Discussion & Conclusion</i>	3: (fair)
6. <i>Figure and Tables</i>	4: (good) Please recheck the figure caption format.
7. <i>Significance of the study</i>	4: (good)
8. <i>Scientific Soundness</i>	4: (good)
9. <i>Language quality</i>	4: (good) Overall, this paper is GOOD.
10. <i>Comments to Authors</i>	Please rephrase this sentence. Make it simple and easy to understand. Page 3 "The discharge value (951.520 m ³ /s) where Q = water discharge value, W = width of the river, Y = water depth, and S = channel slope was estimated using the equation established by [18] in Equation 1." However, there are insufficient/missing references to support the findings, especially in the discussion part. Please improve the discussion and conclusion part.

Review 4
Assessment

1. <i>Originality and novelty</i>	4: (good)
-----------------------------------	------------------

2. <i>Abstract is sufficiently informative</i>	4: (good)
3. <i>Methodology</i>	4: (good)
4. <i>Results</i>	4: (good)
5. <i>Discussion & Conclusion</i>	3: (fair)
6. <i>Figure and Tables</i>	3: (fair)
7. <i>Significance of the study</i>	4: (good)
8. <i>Scientific Soundness</i>	4: (good)
9. <i>Language quality</i>	3: (fair)
10. <i>Comments to Authors</i>	How does the medium-low resolution imagery would contribute towards the improvement on the flood hazard maps accuracy? Improve Figure 5 and 6.