



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “A framework for profiling the characteristics of risk governance in natural hazard contexts” by G. Walker et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 25 June 2013

Journal: NHESS Title: A framework for profiling the characteristics of risk governance in natural hazard contexts Author(s): G. Walker et al. MS No.: nhe-2013-60 MS Type: Research Article Special Issue: Building social capacities for natural hazards: an emerging field for research and practice in Europe

The paper addresses a topic of interest in a clear and competent way. Its contents and conclusions are definitely relevant for research on risk governance and represent a good starting point for future research on this topic. However, the empirical part, with the three examples from different European contexts, is methodologically weak because the authors ground their analysis only on the opinions and views of few stakeholders and researchers. This clearly opens up issues related to the reliability of the results. If possible, a second round of interviews or at least a feedback to support

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the presented findings is highly recommended. Other comments: â€” Chapter 2 and 3: the paper is about the methodology/frameworks for the analysis of risk governance and these 2 chapters are supposedly background sections. Yet, the authors should include also a narrow selection of studies that have come closest to their work but nevertheless failed to navigate the waters that they now chart (i.e. what are the other frameworks for profiling the characteristics of risk governance? What characteristics do they use?). This will also help them to make the link between the background and the results stronger and more consistent than it is at present. â€” Chapter 4: do the authors need to describe all the project phases in so much detail? For the reader it is more interesting to know why they choose the eight governance characteristics -and not others- and how they define them. In other words, in this section it would be better to focus more on the operationalisation of the concept of risk governance. â€” Conclusion: it is suggested to include some comments about: i) the limitations of the study ii) the innovative results for risk governance theory and methodology deriving from the three examples presented by the authors. In conclusion, the framework elaborated for profiling the characteristics of risk governance in different natural hazard contexts definitely represents an innovative result.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/1/C368/2013/nhessd-1-C368-2013-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 2207, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper