

Interactive comment on “A decision-supporting methodology for assessing the sustainability of natural risk management strategies in urban areas” by A. M. Edjossan-Sossou et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 18 March 2014

In general the paper is very well written, and the authors demonstrate a profound knowledge in their field. To my opinion the paper is close to a minor revision, however I decided for a major revision based on this comments:

- Authors discuss 'risk management'. As risk is a widely used term authors need to better justify and explain their definition of risk, and its relation to commonly used concepts defining risk as a function of hazard, vulnerability (and exposure) - The authors propose a variety of indices, such as the SPI, SPR and SA etc. It is not that much clear how they relate to each other, and what they tell us – and how policy and decision makers may apply them. It may be helpful to provide a less detailed (technical) discussion

C191

of the indices, but additionally provide a justification on the purpose of these indices - Authors refer to composite indicator construction, therefore it is questioned why the authors do not apply standard procedures such as the assessment of multi-collinearities etc as for instance outlined in the OECD guide on composite indicator construction - A major drawback is the use of a virtual case study, which does not allow any validation of the approach. This may be in line with a 'discussion' paper but needs better justification.

Few comments are also attached in the pdf.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/2/C191/2014/nhessd-2-C191-2014-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 207, 2014.