

Interactive comment on “Assessment of Social Vulnerability to Natural Hazards in Nepal” by Dipendra Gautam

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 15 May 2017

This is a good study - it has the basis for becoming a good article as overall it is well written - although language needs to be thoroughly revised.

However there are a few key points to consider which is why I am recommending a major revision: 1. I am concerned that your variables do not consider post EQ situation as well as climate change variables which are really creating higher vulnerability for several districts (esp Mustang and Manang which have surprising low vulnerability considering their current situation) and that are not reflected in your results... I encourage you to take another look at your data and see how to incorporate the post EQ situation as well as multi risk... 2. If you are not able to revise your data analysis to incorporate the above mentioned parameters, you really need to develop a much more critical synthesis in your conclusions with a critique of SOVI which does not go far enough in incorporating multi risk nor the post EQ situation.... 3. Your

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



vulnerability formula is not reflected in the results and conclusions - i.e. where do you reflect on perception and resources? Why did you select this formula- where does it come from ? 4. It is not fair to assert that there are no social vulnerability studies from Nepal - your study would be made more relevant by comparing your methods to those used by the NAPA study on climate social vulnerability (Min of Environment 2010)

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2017-137/nhess-2017-137-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-137, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

