

# ***Interactive comment on* “A global comparison of community-based responses to natural hazards” by Barbara Paterson and Anthony Charles**

**Barbara Paterson and Anthony Charles**

barbara@paterson.alt.na

Received and published: 10 June 2019

Author response to review number 2 MS Title: A global comparison of community-based responses to natural hazards Author(s): Barbara Paterson and Anthony Charles MS No.: nhess-2018-353 MS Type: Research article Response to Reviewer 2: Thank you for your review of our paper. We have answered each of your points below. General comments 1. The article subject is interesting and fits the objectives of NHESS. However, some points of the article can lead to unwanted and unproved ideas. On the one hand, the use of only English literature, even if is scientific, can leave large areas of the world without a full coverage of hazards response by communities. From my point of view, you cannot be speaking about Africa with a low coverage when French is largely used by a high number of African countries. The

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



same can happen with Latin America, where Spanish is used in a large amount of scientific papers. I think that a conclusion about a global overview is not absolutely correct, maybe a global overview of English hazards-related literature would be more appropriate. Response: It is true that French is the official language in many African countries, and of course Spanish is spoken across Latin America. However, it is important to note that we are gleaning our data from peer review academic articles. It is widely accepted that English has become the language of choice for many international scholarly journals and the majority of non-English speaking scholars publish in English. In addition, many scholars are based at English speaking universities, irrespective of their own home language or the language spoken in their study area. Also, we would like to point out that under-reporting of disaster consequences in Africa was also found in EmDat data.

2. On the other hand, the date range of the articles used ranges from 1982 to 2014. However, it is said that the majority of research (102 papers) fall within the period 2001 to 2014, thus leaving the starting period with only 86 articles. My question is if the starting period is represented at the same level of the final one? and if the results gathered from that period are as valuable as the ones from the final one? Could the difference explain a change within the scientific community about that topic?

Response: A similar comment was made by reviewer 1. While a possible change in interest within the scientific community is not the focus of this paper, we will consider this for a future analysis of our data. We are not suggesting that the trend of published studies on community response corresponds to the true trend of the communities' responses. What we are suggesting is that the sample of community-based response actions that is gleaned from published, peer reviewed articles is a subset of all response actions. It may be contested whether this sample is representative, however, for a global analysis there is currently no other available data set. 3. Finally, the conclusion is not clear enough regarding how the paper is useful to decision making and planning of response actions. I could find examples of actions and measures but I

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

am not sure if that examples can help communities and policy-makers. Æ Response:

It is not our intention to suggest which kind of responses communities and policy makers should choose in any given situation. In fact, our data does not say which responses are best. We added a sentence in the second paragraph of the conclusion to clarify this point. If there is interest in the success of specific responses or the practicalities of any specific response approaches, then this would require individual communities or decision makers to follow up on the information provided here. But the point is that they would first need to know what is happening in other parts of the world. As we state in the conclusion, this paper provides information for communities and governments about what types of responses are happening around the world so that they can assess their own hazard planning by taking into account what others are doing. This is where the typology we developed provides a useful tool for practical use and for analysis, like that presented in this paper, which is based on the typology.

4. Please note as well that the 4 key questions presented at the start of the paper are not clearly answered in the final section, maybe a short explanation could address this point. For instance, in point 3 you write about specific regions but they are not named, and in point 4 maybe a suggestion about the causes (if the articles used answer that questions) of the lack of multi-hazard responses could explain why that approach is missing around the world.

Response: We have added a sentence about the key questions. As mentioned above our database does not include information on the reasons why particular responses were chosen in particular situations. Consequently, we cannot deduce the causes for the lack of a multi-hazard approach.

Specific comments 5. The authors use for the research a high number of articles but no reference is given to those papers, can be added a list including the references, with basic info such as authors, year of publication, title and affected area/hazard. It can be helpful to readers to understand where and what are being studied and explained in

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

the text.

Response: a similar comment was made by reviewer 1. We would be happy to provide this data. However, including all articles would inflate the references section. Such a table may perhaps be more appropriate as supplementary data.

6. In page 10, when explaining the multi-hazard approach, a list of hazards could be added as the community answer can vary depending of the kind of hazards, including details about which are commonly related. Æ Response: We agree that the community answer could vary depending on the kind of hazard, and included a sentence in the paragraph describing the multi hazard approach to highlight examples of the kind of hazards that might be addressed together using the same approach.

#### Technical comments

7. The authors should correct the references list. Some papers listed as a reference are missing from the text (Barker and McGregor, Sewell et al, WHO) or vice versa (Heijmans in p. 7, Hobson in p. 7, Knowles and Kunreuther in p. 9, Blaikie et al in p. 9) while others are cited as Gall or Gal. Finally, there are two references from Estaban et al, both published in 2013 which is not clear when one or another are used. Adding 2013a and 2013b should help the readers.

Response: We made all these corrections to the reference list as suggested.

Æ

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-353>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

