

Interactive comment on “Analysis of disaster characteristics and emergency response of the Jiuzhaigou earthquake” by Wei Wang et al.

D. E. Alexander (Referee)

david.alexander@ucl.ac.uk

Received and published: 16 January 2018

Page 1, Line 15: "... were more rationally mobilized" - more than what?

Section 1: I am wondering whether China uses an all-hazards approach to emergency preparedness and response or whether it has specific earthquake emergency plans. I also wonder whether a diagram, such as a flow-chart, might help clarify the structure of emergency management in China, including the lines of command and control.

Pge 3, Line 26: "...when the earthquake struck month." - delete 'month'

Line 27: "rolling stones" - rockfalls (or possible debris avalanches)

Page 4, lines 5-6: "...a seismic fortification level of 8 degrees," - it is not clear what this

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



[Interactive comment](#)

means. Seismic resistance, evidently, but eight degrees of what?

Page 5, lines 14-15 (and line 25): "...an "8.8" Jiuzhaigou earthquake relief emergency headquarter[s]" - what does this mean?

Pages 7-8: "...at dusk, did provided orderly maintenance" - substitute 'they' for 'did'

Section 3 resembles many earthquake situation reports I have read over the years. Very little in it is novel. The authors describe a typical post-earthquake convergence reaction.

Page 9, lines 17-19: "By learning from the experiences of the emergency response activities during the Ms 7.1 Yushu earthquake in 2010 and the Ms 7.0 Lushan earthquake in 2013, the Chinese earthquake catastrophe emergency response system has become more mature, and the response mechanisms have greatly improved." - This is important and could provide the basis of an interesting and penetrating analysis.

This paper is nicely written and gives a careful description of the event that the authors report on. However, it seriously lacks depth. In the literature there are various analyses of emergency organisation and emergency response and there is a theoretical side to this. There is no reference to any of this work anywhere in this paper, which is almost entirely a description of an event and the response to it. Various works by Ron Perry, Michael Lindell, David Alexander, David Neal, David Godschalk, William Wallace and others is relevant here.

Readers will be intensely interested to learn about the organisation of emergency response in China (there are few up-to-date sources in English on this) and also about how it has evolved since the signal event of 2008. However, in this manuscript the critical analysis is muted or lacking and the comparison with events, or better still systems, elsewhere is missing.

There are various theoretical aspects that are of interest, as well: the tension between devolution and centrism, incident command versus the hierarchical model, command

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



**Interactive
comment**

versus collaboration, the command function principle versus the support function principle, and so on. More depth is seriously needed, and it could lead to a very interesting and worthwhile paper.

I would be happy to help the authors with references if they have trouble obtaining the literature.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-418>, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

