



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 #2

Received and published: 27 June 2013

This paper is potentially very interesting, but at present further work is needed to tighten up the methodology, arguments made and clarify the rigour and significance of the framework presented. 1) The background sections could be tightened up and made more applicable to an academic audience, if that is the intended target. At the moment, it is not that technical or novel a discussion. Furthermore, the discussion is quite long, and not that well tied into the eventual development of the framework, although I presume that this is the role it plays. Some of the language at time can be a little un-technical and vague, in particular when discussion climate change, global warming and the apparent increase in hazards.

2) The description of the framework focusses more on the methods for developing it than a detailed description of what sits within the framework. While figures 1 & 2 help

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



address this, I would like to see more about the criteria that sit beneath the detail in Figure 1 & 2 if possible. I would also like to see how the spectrum was developed, and where the background literature for that is. I also think it is possible to blend qualitative and quantitative techniques - to develop a clear numerical scale that still has qualitative criteria behind it. At present it is hard to understand how rigorous the application of the framework is.

3) In general the paper is very descriptive and lacks clarity around what exactly is in the framework, how it is applied and a clear analysis of the different case studies explored through it. What does this framework tell you about the effectiveness, accountability, transparency, efficiency etc. of these different governance regimes? The paper tends to be quite discursive and pensive, with less evidence, results and clear conclusions. What is the point to the comparison? Just to have a comparison, or are there some useful conclusions that can be drawn out of the comparisons to inform natural hazard policy? Currently the conclusions are very general and not terribly insightful. The paper can also at times seem repetitive.

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

