

Interactive comment on “Learning risk management of geohazards in practice with free and open-source web-GIS based platform: RISKGIS” by Zar Chi Aye et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 6 April 2017

This paper presents an open-source web GIS platform designed for conducting risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis of mitigation measures. It is an additional paper in a series of papers already published with a similar content (see e.g. Aye et al., 2016c). The tool follows the method, which has become standard in Switzerland for prioritizing mitigation method by the Federal Office for the Environment. As such the presented method is not new. RISKGIS appears to have an appealing design. The project seems to have a lot of potential to make courses on geohazard risk more interesting and hands-on. This supports the generally effective “learning by doing” approach, while better preparing students for work after university. As such the work is very valuable in the education of future natural hazard specialists.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



However, I doubt the scientific contribution of this paper, which is one of main goals of NHESS. Furthermore, the scientific quality is poor, since this paper only describes the tool, its application in case studies and the response of students regarding the performance of the software. The conclusions of students are similar to conclusions already published in Aye et al., 2016c, which reads as “could be further improved”. Therefore, the novelty of this paper could be questioned. Although the paper is well structured and concepts and exercises are described in detail so that the reader can get a good idea of the tool and the students’ work sequence, I cannot recommend the publication unless substantial scientific findings are included in the paper. As our comments indicate, the used terminology should be critically checked since it is not used consistently throughout the paper.

Additionally, please have a native speaker do a detailed revision of the language. Text flow and comprehension need to be improved

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2017-85/nhess-2017-85-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-85, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

