

Interactive comment on “Exposure to Floods, Climate Change, and Poverty in Vietnam” by Mook Bangalore et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 July 2017

In the manuscript, authors assess the distribution of flood exposure among poor and non-poor locations. The topic is interesting and broad. However, the manuscript is far away from publication. I would suggest 'major revision' taking into account following comments:

1. Authors have used the term, 'hazards' and 'risk' interchangeably throughout the manuscript. Authors should take necessary care and consistency of using these terminologies.
2. The paper seems much more policy oriented than academic journal article. How the research contributes to the field of natural hazards is not clear. Certainly the research support to Vietnamese policy makers, but what are the benefits of general readers of the natural hazards (science) community is a big question mark.

C1

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



3. Instead of only considering Vietnamese context, authors should provide state of art on the issue and they should explicitly consider some innovativeness in their research. In first two paragraphs of literature review section, it seems that this kind of research has already been done elsewhere. Therefore, why another similar research is required to the science community? I would suggest to revisit the manuscript.

4. As 'literature review' is usually considered in academic thesis paper (not for journal article), I would suggest to include them within introduction section for better representing state-of-art.

5. I would suggest to consider some recent articles on flood risks in Vietnamese context (e.g., Apel et al., 2016; Chinh et al., 2016, 2017).

6. Authors have considered 'head count rate' for assessing poverty. There are also other indices for assessing poverty. Authors should provide a justification of their choice.

7. In table 3, 'm' within bracket: does it denotes millions? Authors should explicitly define this.

8. No validation of the simulated results has been done except footnote 3 (on Jongman et al. 2014). Is there any national statistics on historical flood exposed population?

9. In the conclusion, I would suggest to generalize some results from the analysis that can also be useful for other areas.

Suggested References Apel, H., Martínez-Trepat, O., Hung, N. N., Chinh, D. T., Merz, B., and Dung, N. V.: Combined fluvial and pluvial urban flood hazard analysis: concept development and application to Can Tho city, Mekong Delta, Vietnam, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 16, 941-961, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-16-941-2016>, 2016.

Chinh, D.T.; Gain, A.K.; Dung, N.V.; Haase, D.; Kreibich, H. Multi-Variate Analyses of Flood Loss in Can Tho City, Mekong Delta. Water 2016, 8, 6.

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

Chinh, D.T.; Dung, N.V.; Gain, A.K.; Kreibich, H. Flood Loss Models and Risk Analysis for Private Households in Can Tho City, Vietnam. *Water* 2017, 9, 313.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-100>, 2017.

NHESD

[Interactive
comment](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

