

Interactive comment on “Resilience issues and challenges into built environments: a review” by Charlotte Heinzlef et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 30 July 2020

General Comments: The manuscript is a review manuscript and presents existing strategies and tools dealing with operationalization of the resilience concept in build environment. Manuscript detailed investigates the “resilience” concept from historical background till today with substantial amount of references. However some important improvements are required. Transitions from any level of titles to its subtitles are very hard. Many times section or sentence start without any preparatory information. In other words sentences comes out of the blue sky. Restructuring the whole manuscript is necessary. The manuscript written mostly with “daily spoken English” with numerous typing error. Besides, due to the complexity of the subject sometimes you lost your way and very hard to follow. For a lighter text a native English check is strongly recommended.

Specific Comment: For historical development of the usage of “resilience” see Alexan-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



der DE (2013). Resilience and disaster risk reduction: an etymological journey. Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci., 13:2707-2716. There are some more details in using first or very early times of “resilience” term in scientific community. Introduction section very similar with Alexandr DE (2013). My suggestion: Re-organise in the way of shortening this section due to large overlap with the Alexander DE (2013) wich published in the same journal.

Technical corrections. Line 37-38: Rephrase as: “Despite its growing success, the operational relevance of the concept is therefore constantly being questioned.” Line 42: “Over the past 20 years or so, . . .” Rephrase as “During last two decades” Line 62: The sentence too equivoke in it is meaning. “Interdisciplinary” itself, or “interdisciplinary approach/ interdisciplinary studies” can serve it. Make clear please. Line 245: Rephrase as “Faced with increasing risks, stakeholders have identified two concepts (Saunders and Becker, 2015); resilience (taking into account the management of disturbances) and sustainable development (analyzing the balanced economic, social and environmental development of the territory).” Line 307: change “metres” with “meters”. Line 415-416: Remove the sentence. You already mentioned in the previous sentence. Another option: you can merge two sentences. Line 422: Replace “IC” with “CI” Line 428: Replace “metro” with “subway” Line 513: Replace subtitle of “ A complex urban system. . .” with “Complexity of an urban system” Line 515: A short introductory sentence required. “. . .of this lack of clarity. . .” “this” refer what? Line 520: “complicates”, use capital letter when you start to a new sentence.

Line 552: Replace subtitle of “. . . Including some limits” with “Some important issues of limitations of resilience concept” Line 554-555: Remove the whole sentence Line 560: Replace “in multiple fields” with “in many fields”. Line 632: This paragraph not connected with its subtitle. It seems to be belong the next section. If so, move there. Line 694: Remove “the Disaster Risk Index (UNDP 2004).” Connect “or” with “the Environmental Sustainability Index.” Line 696: Two times you refer United States. Remove one of them. Line 702: Remove “.” after “future” Line 727: Cutter et al. (2014) is better.

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

Line 728-730: Gramatically incorrect sentence. Rearrange! Line 746-47: Rewrite the whole sentence. A very difficult sentence to understand. Line 817-819 Many “and” in one sentence. Rearrange! Line 851: Remove “.” Line 852: Remove “.” Line 866: Critical Infrastructures (CI) already abbreviated in previous section. Use only the short form. Line 871: “it is” used two times. Line 884: “s”? Line 887 “territory of Norway” is better. Line 927: An Introductory sentence required for why you are going to set a series of subtitles. Line 953-988: You should start with introductory sentences. Then harmonize examples and/or approaches by citing references to present instead of give the summary of the study. Line 977: You already cite to Freeman et al (2020). Is design methodology adopted from Brown et al?. If so, rephrase. If not, clarify it. Line 991: No connection of the paragraph with the previous one and with its title. Line 992: Some references required. “. . .risk strategies (reference/s) Line 1005: In Discussion section it is expected from Authors to summarize basic arguments/findings in first paragraph after an introductory paragraph and continue with one or two more paragraph wich discuss “strong points” of the presented approach and “constrains”. In this study you summarize and presented existing model in Table and give a figure about resilience observatory. I recommend to write this section under different title. In current form this is not “Discussion” of the presented study.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-217>, 2020.

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