

Interactive comment on “Discovering the differential and gendered consequences of natural disasters on the gender gap in life expectancy in Southeast Asia” by Marshal Q. Murillo and Shukui Tan

K. Sudmeier-Rieux (Referee)

karen.sudmeier-rioux@unil.ch

Received and published: 2 October 2018

Review of the manuscript: Discovering the differential and gendered consequences of natural disasters on the gender gap in life expectancy in Southeast Asia

The manuscript topic is certainly worthy of attention and merits a lot more research than what is currently to be found in the literature. However unfortunately the manuscript falls short on a number of points: 1. It is not clear what is new about the research, the hypothesis and findings that will add to our understanding of gender and natural haz-

C1

ards. The fact that women are more at risk and die during a natural hazard event has already been clearly established in the literature. The paper does not quote any major gaps that need to be addressed... rather they quote existing literature (esp Neumayer and Plumper, 2007) for several of their hypothesis. Perhaps the gap that should be articulated is a lack of quantitative evidence to which the study can add more quantitative proof? Even there, I am not sure whether this is a gap.. 2. Since Neumayer and Plumper 2007, the literature on gender and disasters has moved beyond establishing women as victims but rather promotes them as 'agents of change' as part of disaster risk reduction programmes. This is where there are clear research gaps and a lack of ideas on how to advance this agenda. 3. Page 4 line 3 - I would avoid quoting statistics printed in the grey literature (Oxfam 2013). Best to go to the source - most likely EM-DAT, or other more reliable sources. 4. The authors go to great lengths to describe disasters as being human-induced (the jump from Rousseau (1756) to Pande (2000) is a bit much... and the World Bank publication, Unnatural disasters - should be quoted), therefore it is very astonishing that we still find the term 'natural disasters' throughout the manuscript - the term is mostly shunned by academia nowadays. 5. The authors also correlate high socio-economic levels and democracy with better preparedness and response to disasters - and this seems credible, with a few exceptions that should be mentioned, such as Cuba.. 6. Page 5, line 11. female casualties are evidently higher than men (not explained - why?) 7. Page 5, line 21 despite being restricted by... should be: in addition/ or because they are restricted 8. Merit should always be given to non-native speakers who publish in English - however the manuscript needs a lot more editing by a native speaker and quite a lot more refinement /sophistication in order to meet the high standard of NHES articles.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-370>, 2017.

C2