

Interactive comment on “Epistemic uncertainties and natural hazard risk assessment – Part 1: A review of the issues” by K. J. Beven et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 10 December 2015

A review of the issues relating to epistemic uncertainty is very welcome. However, as might be anticipated from a paper with as many as 13 listed authors, it is very disjointed.

Clearly, individual authors have contributed their own sections and paragraphs, relating to the particular natural hazards with which they are most familiar and competent.

However, the most interesting questions are those which relate to understanding why particular methods are suitable and have been adopted for some natural hazards, but not others.

To address such questions requires much more author interaction and dialogue than have taken place during CREDIBLE meetings. Having attended several such meetings, the outcome comes as little surprise, if rather disappointing.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



To resolve the inter-hazard questions would require a major revision to this paper. This might be asking too much of the authors at this stage. What a reader should expect is that the paper be more comprehensible and read as if it were one article, rather than a patchwork of sections. I suggest that the senior author(s) revise the paper to make it more cohesive.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 7333, 2015.

NHESSD

3, C2527–C2528, 2015

Interactive
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

