



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Social capacities for drought risk management in Switzerland” by S. Kruse and I. Seidl

H. March (Referee)

hug.march@gmail.com

Received and published: 6 June 2013

Dear colleagues,

Congratulations for your interesting paper on the analysis of social capacities for drought management in Switzerland. The paper is well-written and well-structured and deals with a very relevant issue.

I have some comments on the following aspects:

1) I wonder if instead of an analysis of the existing (and missing) social capacities what the paper does is to analyze the perception (by different stakeholders) of such social capacities. In the abstract you state that the paper “analyses the social capacities for

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



drought risk management and gaps from the perspective of national and regional water users and policy and decision makers in Switzerland”. In the discussion section you also acknowledge to some extent this fact (“In our research we analysed the perception of drought risk management in Switzerland by water users and policy and decision makers”). But maybe you could reflect further on this nuance and acknowledge it in previous sections of the paper, for instance in the last part of section 2.

2) I do also agree with the editor and referee 1 in extending the notion of droughts to that of “socio-environmental phenomena”. The paper of Kallis (2008) in Annual Review of Environment and Resources is a very relevant contribution which could help you in providing a more critical reflection on the term “drought”.

3) The methods section could benefit from more detail. A more specific description of the different questionnaires, interviews and expert workshop would be desirable, in order to know with more detail which kind of questions were asked. Maybe you could consider adding a table with some examples of the questionnaires.

4) Finally, some editing/technical details:

- It is not clear if in the results you took into account all the interviews and surveys with the representatives. In the methods section you mention 6 economic sectors (p.1362): “we conducted interviews and surveys with representatives of water user groups from different economic sectors potentially sensitive to droughts: agriculture (considering farming, vegetable growing, fruit growing), forestry, water supply, shipping industry, fishery and tourism”. While in the first paragraph of section for you just mention “three economic sectors” (p.1363): “The survey and interview studies with different water user groups in three economic sectors showed that water users have a range of existing mitigation and response measures at hand that they realise in case of droughts and low flow conditions”.

- Check the reference of Vicente-Serrano et al. (2012) in page 1361, line 4, and in table 1.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



- Check also the titles of the figures/tables in the text and at the end of the document as some do not coincide. For instance in page 1366 you refer to table 4 and I am not sure if you really mean table 5 (“The results on the existing and missing social capacities for re-active drought risk management in Switzerland from the perspective of the water users and policy makers are summarised in Table 4”).

Best wishes,

Hug March (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya)

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 1355, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

