

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 March 2019

General comments: 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 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. 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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



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? 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 am not sure if that examples can help communities and policy-makers. 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.

Specific comments: 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 the text. 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.

Technical comments: 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 viceversa (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.

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

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