

Interactive comment on “GLOFs in the WOS: bibliometrics, geographies and global trends of research of glacial lake outburst floods (Web of Science, 1979–2016)” by Adam Emmer

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 16 January 2018

Dear Editor,

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. Author proposed the manuscript “GLOFs in the WOS: bibliometrics, geographies, and global trends of research of glacial lake outburst floods (Web of Science, 1979-2016)”. The analysis of this paper is interesting, but some parts should be improved and think more deeply. I do not know that this paper is suitable for this journal, because this paper does not include scientific research and detail discussion. I still do not understand a benefit information which author would like to show in this paper. Readers of NHES might be more interested in regional differences of GLOF including the characteristics of GLOF, research

C1

themes, and research methods. In addition, it is difficult to show the trend using only Web of Science, because author does not treat local publications.

General comments: 1) It is not clear what this paper will be useful for future GLOF research. What is benefit information for GLOF studies? Please indicate what your suggestions in the future GLOF research, because I cannot confirm your opinion in the manuscript based on data.

2) The tendency of the study area where GLOF occurred and the foreigners were active varies each decade and region. Based on analysis each decade (e.g. between 1979-1999 and 2000-2016), author might understand the transition of the region. Although author analyzed about time series is whether it is a single author or co-authorship, readers do not have great interest about this topic.

4) In this paper, author used the data of Web of Science, but there are many local papers in local journal. For example, it is often written in the USSR. Tables 3 and 4 do not include Russia or USSR. The paradigm shift is clearly a mistake, because this paper is intended for 1979-2016. In USSR territory, there are overwhelmingly local publications before 2000. Please indicate time series each region and mention regions which foreigners wrote mainly (where no paradigm shift has occurred).

5) In HKT, as a representative of local researchers, I think that contribution such as local scientist of ICIMOD is very large, but there is no mention on that point about paradigm shift. One sentence is not enough for explanation of paradigm shift in HKT. This topic should be written more deeply in discussion.

Specific comments and technical notes:

Page 1 L10-L11: What is GLOF research items? Definition of GLOF paper is not clear. For example, glacier lake research (simply changes of lake area) is included? Although theme of papers is glacier changes, there are the cases which these include term of GLOF. Did you confirm each article?

C2

L12: Paradigm over time. . . . Please show the paradigm shift (time series) based on each regional study and activity including local publication, because only data base of Web of Science does not show the correct regional trend.

L18: dam failure and dam overtopping, or glacial lake sub-type?

Page 2 L30: Although articles include term of GLOF, some articles are not theme of GLOF. Did you confirm each article?

Page 6 L7-14: Trends are also different each developing country. You should write concretely the regionality. For example, there are no differences about foreigner activities for Central Asia and Karakoram, but Himalaya are the most common in US and Japan. The contribution of these countries is different each decade since 1979. Based on summary of developing country, it is impossible to see individual details and transition.

Page 9 L2-10: I cannot agree with your opinion. Central Asia and Caucasus have been active mainly by many local researchers since the USSR. They published many articles about GLOF in Russian journal. There is little description of foreigners. In addition to data base of Web of Science, author should use local publications. An example in Himalaya is not appropriate. In Himalaya, we should state the activities of ICIMOD.

L24: Please analyze each region of the developing country.

L25: I think recent local researchers are active in HKT.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-413>, 2017.