Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-256-RC2, 2017 © Author(s) 2017. CC-BY 3.0 License.



NHESSD

Interactive comment

## Interactive comment on "Risk Factors and Perceived Restoration in a Town Destroyed by the 2010 Chile Tsunami" by Carolina Martínez et al.

## A. Armigliato (Referee)

alberto.armigliato@unibo.it

Received and published: 18 January 2017

The paper by Martinez and co-authors address a very interesting topic in the tsunami vulnerability/risk subject. Which criteria should be followed when planning and carrying out the rebuilding of a site/city severely damaged by a tsunami? What kind of approach and analysis can quantify the success/non-success of the adopted strategies? The paper addresses these and other problems by studying the particular case of the Chilean town of Dichato, severely affected by the impact of the 27th February 2010 tsunami. The authors combine vulnerability/risk results and indicators obtained on one hand through numerical modelling and on the other through the statistical analysis of the results of a consistent number of surveys and interviews. The analysis was performed in both pre- and post-disasters conditions. The result is not very encouraging. according to the paper's conclusions: should a 2010-like tsunami strike again Dichato in the



**Discussion paper** 



future, the "new" town would present a risk level very similar to the pre-2010 situation

The paper is generally well written and reaches substantial conclusions. I was able to follow very smoothly sections 5 and 6, while I was in some trouble following all the details of the analyses presented in section 4. A reader, like I am, who has not a daily contact with vulnerability and risk analysis, is faced with a lot of notions that are taken for granted. I think the paper would earn in readability and would attract a larger audience if section 4 can be made more "loquacious", instead of being a list of percentages.

I recommend the authors to carefully check the references. Many of those cited in the text are missing in the references list at the end of the paper.

I am attaching an annotated version of the paper containing some remarks.

Kind regards, Alberto Armigliato

Please also note the supplement to this comment: http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2016-256/nhess-2016-256-RC2-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-256, 2016.

## NHESSD

Interactive comment

**Printer-friendly version** 

Discussion paper

