

***Interactive comment on “Strategies to increase the accessibility of tsunami shelters enhances their adaptive capacity to risks in coastal port cities: The case of Nagoya City, Japan” by Weitao Zhang et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 10 December 2018

I think study on strategies to increase the accessibility of tsunami shelters enhances their adaptive capacity to the hazard-product risk and hazard-affected risk separately is a very interesting and enlightening research. This paper has been well-written; however, there are some major concerns as follows: 1. In the title: Please reduce words number for title to make the key objective be highlighted. There is too much information in the title which makes it difficult to identify the primary objective for this study. 2. In the introduction part: The relationship among hazard-product risk, hazard-affected risk, and adaptive capacity is not expressed very clearly. Please rearrange the explanation

C1

of their relationship. 3. In Section 3.2.: Please explain the “the first transfer stage” and “the second tsunami transfer stage” in Figure 3. 4. In Section 3.2.: Please explain “(long-term) tsunami shelters” and “(short-term) tsunami shelters” shown in Figure 3. 5. In Section 3.3.: Why “the urban service indicator can be used to represent the location of humanized facilities with barrier-free design”? More explanation is suggested to be added. 6. In Section 3.3.: Why Equation (2) and Eq. (3) were assumed that all indicators contributed evenly to the final risk value? More explanation is suggested to be added. 7. In Section 3.4.: More explanation why you use hot spot analysis to identify spatial clustering of the integrated values is suggested. 8. In Section 4.1.: How is Figure 4-c mapped? You should explain it in the text.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-267>, 2018.

C2