

Interactive comment on “Optimisation of decentralisation for effective Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) through the case study of Indonesia” by A. Grady et al.

Dr Djalante (Referee)

riyanti.djalante@gmail.com

Received and published: 29 September 2015

The paper has been written in a good enough quality which can lead to publication. We feel that sentences and ideas are written without proper consideration on how they are related to the previous or next sentences. Sometimes, key words or ideas are not defined.

Please find the following comments:

Abstract: - Please define optimisation of decentralisation - line 10: at lower levels of what? - line 7: framework of what? - line 12: what do you mean by sustainable

C1868

multistakeholder platforms?

Introduction - Please have 1 key message per paragraph. For example in paragraph 2, the authors discussed economic losses after disasters, and suddenly jumped to discuss number of deaths. A number should be written as words at the start of a sentence. - Please have a reference (s) on a sentence in line 13. The use of word consequently calls for causal relationship with the previous sentence. However, the connections there have not been clearly established. - The subsequent paragraphs discuss decentralisation. It is quite hard to follow. Sentences seem to be written without proper examination how they relate one after another. More references are needed. Why only choose Argentina as the case. -The discussion on decentralisation and DRR seem to be written in similar style. What do you mean by decentralisation of disaster risk? -1 sentence in line 18 is not complete. -Explain differences of DRM and DRR when discussed examples from bangladesh and the Philipphines.

Methodology 2. Explain the rationale of choosing the 4As framework, what is the relationship between 4As, 3As and GPF

Findings Findings from the interviews are accepted. Several comments : Please check how interviews could be written as reference. The current presentation style seems too long We suggest for the authors summarise the findings on different roles of institutions in pictures / diagrams

3.3 The discussion seem to focus on the impact of decentralisation of governance in general, rather than how DRR is managed by government at different jurisdictional levels.

4 Results The authors should have a preceding sentence(s) which provide their own analysis and introduces issues to be discussed further in the paragraph, rather than presenting the results of the study/interviews sentences by sentence directly in each paragraph.

C1869

5 Discussion Table 1 should be located as close as possible to the discussions. It is quite hard to locate it and hence the review reading process got interrupted.

The discussion on the gaps brought interesting and important findings on the understanding of DRR institutional arrangements in Indonesia. However, the methods by which the authors were able to generate the gaps were not clearly discussed.

6 Conclusion

line 13 This sentence needed to be explained. If it is the key argument for the paper, it should be stated clearly in the introduction.

Contrary to the statement in line 8, the discussion focussed on Indonesia, and references to those in other developing countries are very little.

Closing statements are also needed.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 5511, 2015.