

Interactive comment on “Brief communication “Loss and Damage from a catastrophic landslide in Nepal”” by Kees van der Geest and Markus Schindler

E. Roberts (Referee)

roberts.erin@gmail.com

Received and published: 29 August 2016

I very much enjoyed reading this paper. The findings are very interesting. However, I would like to have seen it go more in depth into the background, methods, findings and the possible policy implications if appropriate. In fact I felt there was scope for a longer paper. That said in its shorter version the paper could very much benefit from a bit more information in terms of the context (i.e. what are the climate trends in the region in terms of the timing and amount of annual rainfall), an overview of the methods and more space dedicated to findings (i.e. what were the implications of coping strategies? did response and relief strategies recognize and provide access to treatment for mental stress? what was the implication of households adopting erosive coping strategies).

C1

It would also be useful to hear about the possible policy implications of these findings but that might be outside the scope of the paper. Some questions to consider are: what is the role of the state in the context of providing information about climate trends and supporting efforts to mitigate the risk of landslides? What policies could be put in place to prevent the poorest households from sliding further into poverty? However, this might be outside of the scope of a brief communication and/or space constraints might prevent adding too much more content to the paper.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2016-210/nhess-2016-210-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-210, 2016.

C2