

Interactive comment on “Research Trends on Natural Hazards, Disasters, Risk Reduction and Climate Change in Indonesia: A Systematic Literature Review” by Riyanti Djalante

Dr Djalante

riyanti.djalante@gmail.com

Received and published: 19 December 2016

Dear Reviewer, The author would like to say thank you for the valuable comments given on this paper.

Kindly please find detailed responses to each issue raised in the review:

1. Comment: Abstract: The timeline considered isn't it from 1977 as expressed later in the manuscript (line 147; pg 6)?

Response: The sentence is revised Line 10: To address this, the author conducted a systematic literature review of related publications indexed within the SCOPUS database from 1900 to 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



2. Comment: The author reviews three main topics (1) HDR (2) DRR and (3) CC, but the introduction just focuses on the presentation of disaster events in Indonesia and on the comparison between geophysical and hydro-meteor-climato-logical disasters (is this last word correct by the way?). This small introduction (lines 24-35) does not give a clear picture of why the author undertook this review.

Response: Line 32: The aim is rewritten This paper aims to systematically review literature related to natural hazards, risk and disaster risk reduction, along with the strategies to mitigate and manage the events and impacts, as well as climate change vulnerability, impact, and assessments in Indonesia.

3. Comment: I suggest to report the information of figure 2 directly in the text and therefore to remove figure 2.

Response: Figure 2 is removed

4. Comment: Furthermore, after recognizing the gaps of knowledge, the author can present the objectives of the paper. Accordingly, I suggest to finish the introduction section with “this papers aims to systematically review..” that is presented from line 38 onwards in pg.2. Response: Line 30-55 show the elaborations on the aim of the paper.

5. Comment: Research method: The methodology has been undertaken correctly since few researchers explore the systematic literature review, as it is complex and time consuming. Anyway, the sub-chapter 2.1, 2.2, 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 should be merged together into one main body under “2. Research methods”. The chapter 2.3 “Analysis and presentation of results” seems a repetition of the small subchapter presented before for which I suggest merging this in the previous chapter.

Response: The author reorganize this section completely, and to have only sub-headings 2.1 on Data Collection, and and 2.2 on Data Analysis.

6. Comment: Findings and Analysis: The categorization of disaster groups in table 4 is taken from EM-DAT 2016 and any added value is given. I suggest removing the table

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

and integrating the citation in the text. When the author presents each topic (3.1.1-onwards), there is no need to explore them with so many small subchapters (timeline, discussions and focus areas). I suggest to merge these paragraphs trying to give an overall sequence and shape. The same for the topics 3.3.2 and 3.3.3. I think that there are some errors in the numbering of the chapters. Please revise it carefully. The discussion part presented from line 285 to 297 pg. 10-11 is not discussed at all. Please provide some ideas and key points on it. In its form it is a mere list.

Response: The author also simplified this section, and the small subchapters are merged.

6. Comment: The “Progress of Indonesian researchers and organization” chapter is valuable and I personally think that is the core of the paper, never explored in literature before. However, I think that this chapter could be presented without so many subchapters and the author needs to rearrange it merging the information into one main section. Please, try to present the results of this chapter without coping and pasting the paragraphs in chronologically way they are presented now. In addition, the text in lines 328-334 seems an advertisement of first authors as expressed in table 5. I would delete this information or rearranged the way it is presented.

Response: Section 3.2 is also simplified.

6. Table 5. Please report in the caption all the acronyms used (e.g PVMBG, ITB etc). I cannot understand the symbol put after SC, GS, RG. In addition, I would delete the column field “other profile” since does not give any added value. Does the author Surono have a name?

Response: All acronyms have been spelt out when they first used. Column on other profile is deleted Surono is a one name author as stated in Scopus

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2016-342/nhess-2016-342->

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

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-342, 2016.

[Interactive
comment](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

