

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

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.  
doi: 10.5194/nhess-2016-342-RC1, 2016  
© Author(s) 2016. CC-BY 3.0 License

## General Comments:

The paper is a valuable contribution, especially to the researchers from Indonesia. It provides insights and indicates new trends for natural hazards, disaster risk reduction, and climate change research in one of the most high disaster risks profile in Asian region, which motivate and trigger Indonesian researchers to write and publish more of their findings within above 3 scopes of research in the international arena. Please allow me to convey specific comments towards the betterment of the paper below.

## Specific Comments:

<b>Sequence and Content</b>	<b>Deliverance, Usefulness, and Lessons Learned</b> <i>Input regarding the view on the content of the lessons/case studies from the point of view of advantages or usefulness to the readers.</i>	<b>Methodology</b> <i>Input regarding on the suitability of the writing with reference to the standardized writing rules, including the presentation of quotations, case studies, references, etc.</i>
<p><b>Storyline (logical order)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The paper has been presented in the manner, such as: starting from illustrating the different types of natural hazards and risks impacting Indonesia and the comparison between geophysical and hydro-meteor-climato-logical disaster (Line 33-35) (including the graph to underline and distinguished that comparison) and subsequently describing the aims, research questions, advancement of methods, analysis, and conclusion.</li> <li>▪ However, personally, to make this paper a perfect one; the author could link the missing piece of thesis statement or state stronger the relevance between pinpointing the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No doubt, the paper is well formulated, rich with new insights with vast literature, as well as the paper is extremely important for the readers, especially for the Indonesian researchers to take up new information, suggestions, and recommendations from the author. The Indonesian researcher could reflect, and set new courses of researches in terms of HRD, DRR, and CC, for example in areas where there are still huge gaps, according to author, in terms of less number of Indonesian contributions as first author, limited number of Indonesian organizations participate in international collaborations, insufficient power play amongst researchers, research capacity, English academic writing, and incentives.</li> </ul>	<p>In my personal opinion, the writing of the paper is of high quality. The author has used complicated method and required high focus and vast amount of time. The presentation of the quotations and sources of literature have been mentioned throughout the text and in the list of references. Due to vast amount of used references, it is worth to double-check the list in the end of paper, to avoid discrepancies.</p>

<p>comparison of geophysical and hydro-meteor-climato-logical disaster and the aims of the paper. The author could formulate stronger statement(s) of why elaborating the different disasters' impacts in the first place (as the intro) and later the aim(s) of the review. Please kindly state stronger motivation(s) of why reviewing natural hazards-DRR-and CC literatures in Indonesia with supporting references.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ However, it would even better useful, especially for Indonesian researchers if the author could suggest and explore concrete key ideas and how to transform those ideas into practical actions (not only referring the setbacks) i.e. to conduct better/improve research, negotiate for authorship amongst international researchers, overcome challenges in international collaborations, factors contributing in improving research capacities including academic writing in English, and innovation of some sort of incentives for international collaborations and publications. These might very useful to the readers and add precious value to the paper.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Content's proportion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proportion of the content is illustrated very well. Minor suggestion would be in every section of HRD, DRR, and CC, especially in the section of Finding and Analysis; it would be better to elaborate more on the timeline, discussions, and focus area part.</li> <li>▪ It would be even better to have a summary/overview table of key findings and analysis with x-axis are the HRD, DRR, and CC and y-axis are the timeline, discussions, and focus area.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Consistency of used terms and accuracy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Please kindly check the used terms of hydro-meteor-climato-logical disaster (Line 33), whether it is the correct writing? And whether the above term is in line and consistent with the later used term throughout the text? For example in Line 176-177, Line 188, and Line 432.</li> <li>▪ The used term risk reduction maybe is a minor typo as risk deduction in Line 505-506.</li> <li>▪ It would be better to spell out/introduce the abbreviations and acronyms used in the paper for the first time (within parenthesis) and</li> </ul>		

later on only mention the short term.		
<b>Content's structure</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The content of the structure in this paper is well organized. Minor suggestions would be on the content's proportion and consistency of the used terms (please kindly see the comments for the proportion and structure boxes).</li> </ul>		
<b>Inter-linkages between parts</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The link between different parts is strongly shown in the writing; although stronger link is needed to rationalize the purpose of the paper and the written different impacts of different type of disasters that were stated in the introduction part.</li> </ul>		
<b>Content vs. Theme</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In my opinion, the content of this paper is generally justified with the overarching theme. Minor adjustments would be only on the aforementioned comments.</li> </ul>		