

Interactive comment on “An adaptive regional vulnerability assessment model: Review and concepts for data-scarce regions” by Mark Bawa Malgwi et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 16 January 2020

The paper brings an important contribution to the field of disaster risk reduction and is worth of publication. However, an important effort of synthesis is required. Often the information is repetitive, little elaborated and some other times not relevant enough with respect to the objectives and subject of the paper. This makes difficult to review the paper. For instance, sections 2.1 and 2.2 present many subsections and secondary information which are too general and more relevant for the format of a report than for a scientific article. The authors should make an effort to reduce redundancy and secondary information to streamline the message and render the paper readable by better targeting the specific gap they are addressing.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Minor comments on the initial part of the paper: Title: if the all method is tailored only to flood perhaps include this in the title. Also, perhaps “adaptive” is little informative and generates confusion with the adaptation component frequently used in the DRR literature. I suggest using the word “generic”: “A generic regional flood vulnerability assessment model: Review and concepts for data-scarce regions” Line 13: is this physical vulnerability to floods only? Perhaps add “to floods” after physical vulnerability Line 16: not clear what “local protection elements stand for in the context of that sentence Lines 61-62: insert commas after “e.g.” Lines 72-78: perhaps have this paragraph in this format: “. . .studies earthquakes (cite cite cite), landslides (cite cite cite), tsunamis (cite cite cite) . . .” and so on. Line 80: you mean “physical vulnerability assessment methods”? I’d always add “physical” to “vulnerability” to specify that you look at this type of vulnerability Line 82: “Vulnerability assessment methods are mainly used to estimate damage or loss.” It’s a repetition from line 68 Lines 82-83: this is a repetition from lines 35-37 Lines 82-98: perhaps connect this part on models with the previous part in which you also review methods to assess physical vulnerability. Is there any overlap? Lines 121-123: not clear Line 128: what do you mean by “combination of methods” expert based and modeling? Section 2: there is overlap and repetition with Lines 64-81. Perhaps reduce section 1 to the main points you want to bring forward in the study and move those lines to section 2. Line 162: you mean “buildings’ vulnerability”? What is it meant by “framing indicator schemes”? Line 165: revise punctuation here. Line 170: use Papatoma-Koehle instead of Papatoma Line 175-177: this is a repetition from Line 165. Section 2.2.1 this section might be reduced to a sentence. There seems no need to have a separate section. Also, most of the information contained in this subsection is always consistent with the title of the section. The numbering of the section does not seem to be correct Lines 198-199: the sentence is unclear Section 2.1.4: Application of what? The title of the section is not informative enough. Overall the section seems to provide redundant information Lines 216-218: Perhaps change to “Spatial scales for assessing vulnerability can be micro-, meso- or macro”. And you mean indices or indicators? Line 223: “smaller” or “bigger”?

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

Section 2.1.5: you use interchangeably micro, small and local. To be consistent please chose one formulation. Lines 226-227: not sure about the information provided in this sentence. . . .

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-366>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

