

***Interactive comment on “Natural Disasters in Southeastern Brazil Associated with the South Atlantic Convergence Zone” by Jonas Teixeira Nery and Leônidas Malvestio***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 2 May 2017

The submitted manuscript is based on a master thesis, which aims to link the South Atlantic Convergence Zone (SACZ) to natural disasters in south-eastern Brazil.

In its current state, I cannot support the publication of the manuscript, as it does not substantially contribute to a better understanding of the natural hazards in the study area.

The scientific quality of the manuscript needs to be improved considering the following aspects:

- The title does not reflect the content of the paper as the term ‘natural disasters’ is too broad for what the study actually covers.

C1

- The abstract is not very clear and not easy to understand by a general audience.

- The manuscript does not provide little context to already published literature in the field of research addressed. So it is difficult to assess the added value of the case study (e.g. what is the gap in the current knowledge, that this study can help to fill).

- The methods and the analysis are not clearly described. It is difficult to decipher what has actually been done in the study.

- The results (or the discussion of them) are mainly descriptive, often at the event scale. Some regional assessment is conducted; however, without a map or any additional information, it is almost impossible for the reader to make any connection (spatial and/or temporal) between the episodes described.

- Overall, the manuscript lacks some detailed quantitative assessment. Therefore, it is difficult to draw any general findings and conclusions. Maybe the authors can illustrate their results on a map instead of tables as a first step but also reduce the number of maps currently in the manuscript (see comment below).

- It is not very clear how the figures/maps provided can be used to support the analysis/results. I encourage the authors to better describe how the maps were derived and how they link to the results. Maybe instead of showing several maps for different dates, the authors should aim for some general pattern or theory.

- There is no separate section in which the results are presented. Instead, the section is called ‘discussion of results’, in which the events are described in detail, but there is no thorough presentation of the results in the first place. Additionally, the discussion of the results does not provide links to related works in the field.

- The English language of the manuscript is of poor quality, which makes it difficult to understand certain aspects of the paper. Therefore, the manuscript requires additional language editing to allow for a more detailed peer review.

- The latest reference used in the manuscript is from 2012. I’m sure that since then

C2

some research has been done in that area. Therefore, more up-to-date literature should also be included.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2015-33, 2017.