

Interactive comment on ““We can help us”: Does Community Resilience Buffer Against the Negative Impact of Flooding on Mental Health?” by Torsten Masson et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 13 March 2019

*** General comments The manuscript addresses an important in disaster research – social aspects of individuals and communities in recovering from disasters, with particular focus on social support as a psychological resource and how different forms of social support (individual vs. collective) contribute to better mental health outcomes. Employing a sample situated in a particular disaster site and with very recent flooding experience is of great value. Though not giving a causality perspective, the findings provide a detailed correlation-based understanding of the interplay between social support and mental health outcomes as well as life satisfaction as a long-term recovery indicator. Overall, the manuscript is well-written, but there are various points that needs to be taken care of so that the study and its findings are more effectively disseminated.

C1

*** Specific comments * In the introduction section, community resilience and its role as a social support mechanism should be given more emphasis as this is the very critical topic of the study. * p.5, lines 110-112: protective role of social support on mental health is not an assumption – it has been validated by many research findings. This sentence should be revised so that it does not frame this role as an assumption. * Use of “provide support” or “support” where the word “corroborated” is used throughout the manuscript – a suggestion. * p.8, lines 189-190: The rationale for expecting “the buffering effect of social support to be more pronounced when applying measures of collective (vs. interpersonal) social support.” needs to be more clearly explained. * The study is based on a specific case study (flooding in Bavaria, 2016), but the case study context is not explained. Sociodemographic and cultural characteristics as well as disaster risk and governance information should be given briefly so that readers know the case site better to make sense of the findings. * Data was collected in two mediums: paper-pencil and online – N for each should be given. Also, did the researchers check whether there were significant differences in main study variables between these two groups? If not, this should also be indicated as a rationale for analyzing the two data sets together. * Method section could be revised and rearranged to include each variable (or set of variables) as separate subtopics and give more detailed information under each. In the current version of method, it can be hard to read and follow the variables and how they were assessed. It would also be nice to have each measure in the appendix – it is important to make sense of the results. * Did the researchers analyze the correlations between main study variables and disaster-related sociodemographic variables (property ownership and previous flood experience)? Were there any significant correlations? If so, this should be indicated and the analyses should be repeated to see if the results change or not, and reported accordingly. * Community resilience items seem to reflect a description of community characteristics – they do not reflect whether respondents consider and/or use these characteristics as a means of collective social support themselves. Thus, there seems to be an assumption here. The researchers should explain this in the method section

C2

and also discuss its possible influence on the findings. * More information about the adaptation of CART scale into German should be given in the method section. * The rationale for selecting the particular items from the original scales should be given for each variable. * I suggest the readers to refer to findings of the emBRACE project where community resilience was the main study topic, in different disaster contexts and from different theoretical and methodological perspectives. * Overall output of the project; the community disaster resilience framework (book) :<https://www.wiley.com/eng/Framing+Community+Disaster+Resilience-p-9781119165965> * Particular case study finding on perceptions of community resilience in earthquake context (article): <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420915301849> * Particular case study finding on psychological resilience in earthquake context (article): <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15325024.2015.1108794> . . .

*** Technical corrections * use of “&” between authors of end-text references with 2 or 3 authors (not “and”) * use of “,” after “e.g.” — that is, “e.g., word” * use of apostrophes with Times New Roman font (there are ones who are no written with this font) * use of comma before “and” for cases like “aaa, bbb, and ccc” (when there are three or more factors listed) * Statistical values in the Results section should be checked as some of them are different from the values indicated in the tables. * p. 2, line 25: “. . . might have . . .” (HAVE instead of HAS) * p.3, line 42: “people’s health” apostrophe is not written with the font Times New Roman. * p.3, line 42: “people’s” (apostrophe should be used before the letter s) * p.3, line 50: “exposure” can be preferred instead of “exposition” * p.3, line 42: “e.g., social support” (comma after the letter g.) * p.4, line 61: parenthesis before “Pfefferbaum” should be deleted. * p. 4, lines 64-71: Presentation of the article structure seems to be too mechanically written. This can be distracting for the research aim mentioned just before. It would be better to elaborate on the research aim, specifying the variables of interest – instead of giving the article structure (article structure is as expected, no need to mention that!). Still, if deemed necessary, at the end of this paragraph a short sentence outlining the introduction subtopics can be used. * p.4, line 73: “flooding losses (both financial and non-financial)” (place of parenthesis

C3

information can be changed as indicated) * p.4, line 76: “. . . pain), and . . .” (comma after parenthesis) * p.4, line 78: “negatively affected” (adverb before the verb) * p.4, line 78: “well-being” (not wellbeing) * p.4, line 81: “Stein et al.,” (space after “et”) * p.4, lines 82-84: (e.g., . . . [references]; for a review, see Ohl & Tapsell, 2000) * p.4, line 86: “. . ., 2016.” (dot after the parenthesis) * p.5, lines 87-88: the first sentence of a paragraph should not start with “although”. It can be revised not to include “although” in the beginning. * p.5, lines 94-96: no need to give definition of ego-resilience with direct quotation, paraphrasing would be enough and also better. * p.5, line 99: “relocation need” (instead of “the need to relocation”) * p.5, line 101: “. . . ; Mason et al., 2010.” (dot after the parenthesis) * p.5., line 103: no need for parenthesis before “Dittrich” * p.5., lines 107-109: (e.g., aaa, bbb, ccc, and ddd; author1 & author 2, year). — this is a more accurate way of giving examples with references at the end. I will not specifically write this correction in the following cases. * p.6, line 119: “do not” (instead of cannot) * p.6., line 135: “In flood context, empirical evidence for . . .” (omission of the’s) * p.7, line 147: “They first provided . . .” * p.7, line 161: “. . ., these findings need further replications to reach firm conclusions.” * p.7, line 162: “Taken together” (instead of “In sum”) * p.8, line 182: “but also to society” (adding “also”) * p.8, line 187: “Resilience communities are described as being able to “. . .” (. . .)” * p.8, line 191: “To further explore the topic, the present research . . .” (instead of “more exploratory”) * p.8, line 191-192: It would be better to revise this sentence to more clearly indicate what it is meant to say so that hypotheses 6 & 7 can be better understood. * p.9, lines 195-196: No need to start a new paragraph for “Extending this work . . .” – two sentences should be in the same paragraph. * p.9, line 198: “contribute” instead of “complement” * p.9, lines 201-202: suggestion “Particularly, our research focuses on the following hypotheses:” * p.9, lines 214-215: “consequences of flooding” * p.10, line 224: “consists of” (instead of “contains”) * p.10, line 224: “aged between 18 and 80” * p.10, line 243: “e.g., . . .” instead of “example item” (same suggestion in other cases where this phrase is used in the method section) * p.10, lines 261-263: Why ego-resilience was used as a covariate? The rationale needs to be clearly stated. * p.12,

C4

line 296: “psychological and physical distress” (“and” instead of “&”) * p.12, line 298: “distress and sense of coherence” (“and” instead of “&”) * p.13, line 319: “. . . explained 35% of the variance . . .” * p.17, line 427-428: “. . . for improving our understanding of . . .” * p.18, line 456: semicolon should be used between references * p.18, line 459: “social and social life” – there seems to be sth wrong here. * p.19, line 470-474: CART-related sentences seem to be very similar with those in the method section. There is need for paraphrasing here.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-389>, 2019.