Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

EGU

Discussions

NHESSD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "Integrated evaluation of water-related disasters using the analytical hierarchy process under land use change and climate change issues in Laos" *by* Sengphrachanh Phrakonkham et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 15 September 2020

Generally, this is an important work for a data sparse country. Even though authors tried to develop multi-hazard maps, there are issues with this work. Hence a round of revision is essential. I have outlined my comments below to consider for improvement: [1] Line 19: a comma is essential after country [2] line 22: instead of 'can lead to' you may change to 'can increase' [3] there are a number of important works in this space which require attention. It seems that the current version lacks of international significance of this work. Hence think they may consider the following works to improve its readership. Furthermore, authors reviewed existing works but missed

[Printer-friendly version]

[Discussion paper]

many in the area https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/pdf/10.1098/rsos.191957 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212420920312632 https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264837720305470 https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-020-69233-2 Line 66: There is a big contraction to your aim described here with that of aim in the abstract section. In the abstract, you are stating to develop an approach but here is a reliable flood hazard map? Which one is correct? This requires serious attention Section 3.2: What do you mean by expressions in lines 108-109? Unclear. What was the resolution of DEM and what was the vertical accuracy of the model? Clarify Section 3.6.1 This section requires describing the method clearly, how have you done this? Existing texts do not support this Line 174: should be "we wanted to.." Line 185: How they have been chosen? At random? Was there any ethical permission sought? What were the main elements of questionnaire? Discussion section is not properly reflecting what are you trying to achieve relative to your objective(s). Specifically, analyse and interpret your findings with the aid of theory, show similarities, dissimilarities. How your finding(s) differs from theory? Existing works showed above may be of help. Conclusion section is also need improvements. What are the limitations? What are the take-home message(s) of this work? Nothing is clear. As it currently stands, conclusion section is sketchy and does not lead to useful conclusion(s) Reduce number of maps in the work, show only crucial ones and the rest can go into Sup Info

---