

## ***Interactive comment on “The connection between long-term and short-term risk management strategies: examples from land-use planning and emergency management in four European case studies” by K. Prenger-Berninghoff et al.***

**L. Highland (Referee)**

highland@usgs.gov

Received and published: 5 September 2014

GENERAL COMMENTS The paper discusses a worthy topic and provides examples, and the authors seem knowledgeable about the topic. The reviewer appreciates the multi-lingual challenges in such an undertaking. What is your goal in writing this paper? Is it a scholarly study incorporating all known papers on the topic, or is it to inform decision-makers? If the latter, the paper definitely needs to be much shortened with some of the comparisons and differences between the 4 case studies in tabular form.

C1984

The paper would benefit by having more of the information in the form of your excellent Figure 3. The narrative is too wordy and dense, although the English is impeccable and descriptive. Many of the sentences could be shortened and/or re-organized.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS In the absence of a section for keywords, the introduction and abstract should mention the topics of “flood” and “landslide” that are found in the rest of the paper. As it is now, floods and landslides are not even mentioned until page 8. Understandably, the topics of risk management and land-use are intra-hazard in nature, and perhaps most of the discussion can be generic, but all of the case studies you discuss involve flood and landslide, and to the extent that these are unique hazards in their own way, should be emphasized or at least prioritized in the discussion. The alternative is to add a keywords section. Suggest a different title (two examples follow): “Floods and landslide hazard mitigation in 4 European case studies of land-use planning: A comparison of long and short-term risk management” Or “The connection between long and short-term risk management: Land-use planning and case studies of flood and landslide hazards in 4 European locations (or, countries).” Hazards in general are different enough in their characteristics that you would want someone searching for flood and/or landslide hazards studies to be able to find this paper, if searching by title (again, there is no keywords section). A very short description of the CHANGES project would be helpful to the reader – either in footnote or within main text.

Figures 4 and 5 – although much of the key/legend is understandably not legible as a figure in this paper, suggest that the color-codes should be legible to the reader. Alternatively, you could describe the colors and what they represent in the caption. (for example: “The blue areas indicates xxx, the pink indicates xxx and the white indicates xxx”). This is probably optional, but it would make the figures more interesting and informative. Also in figure 4, what comprises a “geomorphological hazard? You might add whether it is debris flows, floods, landslides – it looks like debris flows but not sure.

Fig. 5 – what type of risk is the map illustrating? Probability? Susceptibility? Both?

C1985

Add to figure caption.

ARCUS 2005 referred to on page 3162, should be explained – is it a GIS? Or other type of analytic tool? You describe what it does, but not what it is – In Figure 7, ARCUS 2005 is illustrated, which is a good idea–What kind of parameters go into it, for example, could be added in the caption. Alos, what does the map show? The yellow squares look like infrastructure (?) and the red circle some type of boundary (?). It would be helpful to the reader to describe what the symbols and polygons are. Add the name of the country to the caption.

Figure 7 needs more information in the caption – add what the map is illustrating – saying it is System ARCUS 2005 only, leaves the reader wondering what it is showing. Add the name of the country that the map is illustrating, for those not familiar with European geography. Even though you describe Fig. 7 in the text, the caption needs a little more information. The conclusion section is much too wordy, and perhaps some bullets outlining main conclusions could be incorporated, to reduce the length of the descriptions. Many readers read only the abstract, introduction and conclusions of papers and these should virtually stand alone to inform the user of basic ideas. Some type of figure incorporating conclusion main ideas could be added to the paper, and referred to in the conclusions section.

**TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS** Figure 2 is a good figure and very illustrative in a concise form – however, I could not discern the source of the phases of the disaster risk cycle – you refer to (Baas et al., 2008), in the text, and (Jha et al., 2013) in the figure caption. It is just a bit confusing, and could be easily clarified.

The acronym DRM in line 20 is not identified (spell out in parentheses)

The acronym PAI in line 25 needs to be identified, even though the reader is asked to refer to Sect. 2.1, the acronym should be spelled out.

I did not notice typos or mis-use of words in the text

---

C1986

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 3137, 2014.

C1987