

## ***Interactive comment on “A multi-hazard risk prioritization framework for cultural heritage assets” by Giacomo Sevieri et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 24 February 2020

The manuscript focuses a very relevant topic and discusses interesting new ideas for prioritizing risk reduction measures in historic buildings. The manuscript is very clear and well written, and I only have the following minor comments/suggestions to make.

1) Regarding the Introduction, authors should clearly define the typology of cultural heritage assets that are focussed by the risk prioritization approach they propose. Since the referred CH assets are building-like reinforced concrete frame and masonry structures, the applicability of the proposed approach is restricted to this type of assets and this should be mentioned in the Introduction. This way the discussion in Section 2 will be framed more clearly. In the current version of the manuscript, the reader only finds this clearly stated in Section 3.1.

2) Still on the typology of the cultural heritage assets, authors refer that Filipino cultural

heritage also includes mixed structures. Reference to this type of structure is only mentioned in Section 3.1. Assuming that the proposed risk prioritization approach does not cover this type of structure (the presentation of the proposed approach only focuses structures that are either reinforced concrete or masonry), authors should refer this issue in Section 3.1

3) In line 2015 (page 8), authors discuss the definition of cultural heritage and refer to the criteria set by UNESCO in the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. However, the line of reasoning suggested by the authors generalizes the context of the guidelines in a way that is not intended by their scope: the Operational Guidelines do not define cultural heritage, the Operational Guidelines define what is considered World Heritage, which within the UNESCO jargon is made of three types of heritage: natural, cultural and mixed (cultural and natural). As such, given the context that authors are discussing (i.e. different views of what is cultural heritage) perhaps a more suitable reference would be (Vecco, 2010)

Vecco, M. (2010). A definition of cultural heritage: From the tangible to the intangible. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 11(3), 321-324.

4) Figure 2 is a bit too small for clear readability. It could be included as a full-page figure (rotated 90°) or included as supplemental data. 5) In Section 3.5 authors discuss how to include the intangible nature of cultural heritage value within their approach. Although their proposal is adequate and simple, other approaches have been recently proposed that are able to provide a larger differentiation between the assets while maintaining an adequate level of simplicity (e.g. see the definition of baseline value in (Romão and Paupério, 2019)).

Romão, X., Paupério, E. (2019). An Indicator for Post-disaster Economic Loss Valuation of Impacts on Cultural Heritage. *International Journal of Architectural Heritage*, DOI: 10.1080/15583058.2019.1643948

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

2020-7, 2020.

NHESSD

---

[Interactive  
comment](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

