

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.

Md. Shibly Sadik (Referee)

ssjony@gmail.com

Received and published: 16 May 2020

The paper brings a new way of thinking resilience. It discussed the current discourses and approaches of resilience science from a different perspective – naturalist and constructivist. Arguments were nicely presented with necessary discussion and clarification in most of the cases. However, there are some issues and limitation appeared to me which should be resolved or addressed before publication. First, the introduction chapter was difficult to follow. It appears that it suddenly jumped to introducing the content of the paper after mentioning the aim of the research. It is difficult to follow whether it is a part of the background review or methodology.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Besides, refereeing to published research is necessary for a few places (please see the attachment for detail). Second, at several locations, SES is correlated to the debate between naturalist and constructivist perspectives of resilience which is interesting. However, given the context of the research, especially the discussion on adaptive resilience and transformative resilience, it would be appropriate if the author tried to bring the Panarchy theory (by Gunderson and Holling 2003) in the discussion, it would be more interesting and appropriate. It would be interesting to know whether his statement “adaptive resilience obstructs transformative resilience” aligns or conflicts with the Panarchy theory of adaptive cycle and resilience building. Third, the author tried to generalize that the application of AI strengthens adaptive resilience and weakens transformative resilience. The reference he provided to justify his argument (i.e. Khakurel et. al. 2018) does not entirely support his comment. To establish his comment/judgment he needs more examples and arguments. However, it cannot be generalized for all cases. One can argue that the use of AI can build transformative resilience. For example, the capacity for anticipating future events is an element of transformative resilience. AI can help us in anticipating future events more accurately. Thus, AI helps to build transformative resilience. Fourth, section 2 – diversification of resilience research, it is not easy to follow the direction of the discussion. If the authors explicitly mention the direction of the discussion in the beginning and the key messages at the end, it would guide the readers. Fifth, at several places the authors need to validate his statement or argument with appropriate references. For example – In lines 196-199, the authors mentioned that when government failed to provide water supply, it advocated for community-based water management in East Africa. Such statement should be validated with appropriate references. In lines 210-212, authors mentioned that hurricane Katrina as a racial flood that brought back colonial patterns of racism, slavery, and vulnerability which must be validated by appropriate reference. Sixth, the authors used many jargons some of them might be very common in social and political science and a few of them are new, for example, “climate gentrification”, “climate apartheid”, “transfiguration”, etc. It would be helpful for the reader if these

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

jargons are briefly defined in the text for the reader.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2020-90/nhess-2020-90-RC2-supplement.pdf>

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

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

