

# ***Interactive comment on “Research trends on hazards, disasters, risk reduction and climate change in Indonesia: a systematic literature review” by R. Djalante***

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 8 June 2016

The paper presents a systematic literature review of the research trends on natural hazards, DRR and climate change in Indonesia. This paper has the potential to be very impacting in the scientific community enhancing new relevant topics to be further investigated in the Indonesian country. However there is the need of a hard reworking for several reasons, for which I suggest a major revision. However, I think that if all the comments suggested will be not addressed adequately the paper would be not suitable for publishing. In addition an English language revision is needed.

1-The abstract needs to be summarized, avoiding useless details (for ex. line 24-25, the number of publications per stage etc). I suggest writing no more than 350 words.

2-The introduction lacks of research gaps identification. The author should emphasize

the importance of this literature review (e.g., Sendai Framework for DRR) by developing a more solid introduction that would bring the reader to the following chapters. It lacks comments on the topics involved in the review. For instance the author needs to clarify in which context “climate change” has been considered (i.e. broad sense or related to natural disasters). The same should be done for all the themes (disasters and risk and DRR). In addition, I think it is not necessary to list more than 20 review papers (lines 85-91) showing the same methodology based on a whole range of different topics.

3-In the methodology there is no clear delineation of the timeline the author chose for selecting the paper for the reviewing process.

4-The results section lacks of comments, trends and justifications of the results obtained. There is the need to elaborate the findings and give some interpretations to them without being repetitive. The decision to develop the two objectives separately is good. However the many sub-chapters created made the paper redundant (in term of results and charts presented) and difficult to read. This is valid for both the objectives. A general rearranging of the structure of the paper is needed.

A review paper is a useful tool to give other researchers the state of the art of the current research and advances. It is not just a mere list of the topics of the papers found. As it is impossible to mention all the papers ( $\approx 750$  are too many) the author needs to justify the methodology of citation (the most recent, the most important, the most cited etc) and provide added comments.

Regarding the second objective (i.e. authorship) there are too many abbreviations that need to be expressed at least once and an additional explanation is needed for the provided tables. Moreover, at line 409 the author considered the gender of the authorship of the selected papers. I think this should need more emphasis, consideration and background.

5-There is a general lack of discussion in the results section that determines the poor conclusions and recommendations for further research. There is just a mention of the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



tips for further research that need to be enriched.

6-Appendix 1 gives no added value to the paper.

7-Figures and tables: (a) There are too many tables and figures that do not give any additional value to the review. Most of them can be easily replaced with one or two sentences in the text. (b) In many of the bar charts the sum the author provided in the caption does not match the real sum showed by the bars. This bias has been found in some figures and tables. Is this a lack of attention or a justifiable bias? In addition, in Table 5, the citation average of the first row should be 8.21 not 8.0. Please check all of the figures, tables and captions. (c) Generally the captions lacks totally of details, are poor in content and sometimes of agreement. There are no references of the timeframe, places etc, and some of the charts lack of x or y labels. (d) The hazard map (Fig.1) presented in the introduction lacks of a legend expressing the colors (supposed to show the level of hazard) and the reference is missing in the reference list. I think that a risk map would be suitable to show the risk profile of the country since Risk is defined by Hazard x Vulnerability x Exposure.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-112, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)