

Referee Report

Analysis of Employment Change in Response to Hurricane Landfalls

Natural Hazard and Earth System Sciences

NHESS-2019-201

Overview

This paper conducts an analysis of how employment responded to large hurricane events and finds that in some cases, Hurricane Katrina in Orleans Parish, the effects can be long lasting but in others, like the Houston area after Hurricane Ike, effects are short term. This analysis is a good addition to the literature and should be published. However, this paper needs some work before acceptance. My comments are listed below in two categories; 1) writing and 2) needed work on the qualitative section.

Writing

For most of the piece the writing is fine but there are enough instances of awkward language, missing punctuation and grammar that it is sometimes difficult to read. Below is a list the line numbers of sentences that need attention.

Line numbers: 40, 60, 69, 79, 89, 94, 152, 164, 200, 202, 207, 226, 250, 253

Qualitative Section (Lines 233 – 292)

First, shouldn't this section be separate from Section 4? Next, this is the weakest piece of the author's argument. I don't see it as a qualitative analysis of resilience in the aftermath of both Katrina and Ike but simply a recitation of information provided by other entities. Studies which interviewed residents after the storms and compared their assessment would make a better case than listing how the difference in warnings made residents better prepared. Then the statement is made that Fort Bend County is deficient in natural and human capital. Based on what? Beginning on line 278 the authors quote Abel et al (2006) about the ability to self-organize is an important element in resilience. Great point. How can they show that this happened in some places and not others without citing or conducting a qualitative study to show that?