

Interactive comment on “Review article: Towards a context-driven research: a state-of-the-art review of resilience research on climate change” by Ringo Ossewaarde et al.

Ringo Ossewaarde et al.

m.r.r.ossewaarde@utwente.nl

Received and published: 15 June 2020

Dear referee,

Thank you very kindly for your comments on our paper and for your critical and constructive feedback that will enable us to improve our paper. You give us six points of feedback. We wish to work with your feedback in the following way.

1. You mention that the introduction section is difficult to follow and unclear. You stress that in the introduction section it is difficult to follow whether it is a part of the background review or methodology. We take your comment at heart and revise the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



introduction section, in line with your comments. 2. You give us the advice to bring the panarchy theory in our discussion on adaptive and transformative resilience, particularly to find out whether “adaptive resilience obstructs transformative resilience” aligns or conflicts with the Panarchy theory of adaptive cycle and resilience building. We find this an interesting and relevant advice that we will follow in our revised manuscript. We will add the discussion on the panarchy theory to the discussion on adaptive and transformative resilience. 3. You stress that we generalize too easily that the application of AI strengthens adaptive resilience and weakens transformative resilience; and that we need more examples and arguments for this. You stress that it cannot be generalized for all cases; and that AI can also help to build transformative resilience, given that the capacity for anticipating future events is an element of transformative resilience. We find your comment very relevant and will work with your comment in our revised manuscript, rethinking our argument. In revising our manuscript, we will include more concrete examples, which we will discuss amongst the co-authors of our article. 1. You stress that section 2 needs more direction in the discussion. We take your comment at heart. We will revise this section, to ensure structure and readability and guidance for the reader, being explicit in the point that we seek to make. We will ensure that the article (its writing style, its formulations, its line of argumentation, its conceptualizations, its choice of words etc.) is easy to follow for a broader audience. In line with your advice, we will revise the writing style, replacing complex terms and making shorter sentences. And in line with your feedback, we revise the article to ensure that concepts will be more clearly defined and better explained and illustrated and concretized, without introducing too many concepts. Also, in line with your feedback, we will have a careful look at the grammar and clarity of sentences. And our plan is to develop a figure that visualizes how the core concepts of the paper relate to each other. 4. You mention that in some places we fail to include appropriate references in our discussion; and you give examples of this. We will revise the paper with your comment in mind, making sure that we make the appropriate references. 5. You mention that we frequently introduce jargon that we leave undefined, and you give examples

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of this. With your comment in mind, we will revise the article, making sure that if we introduce jargon or concepts, we describe them accurately.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2020-90>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

