Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Discussions

Open Access

EGU

Interactive comment on "Evaluating and analyzing the comprehensive community disaster reduction capability" *by* Dajun Lian et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 6 August 2018

The paper addresses an important and timely topic. Community's role in disaster reduction has been emphasized in both the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030) and the Chinese disaster reduction plans. The authors present an index-based approach for calculating the community comprehensive disaster reduction capability (CCDRC) and a case study in Suzhou, China. Such research is definitely needed in the scientific scholarship. Unfortunately, this paper needs to be enhanced thoroughly. I would encourage the authors to revisit the work and ensure that the research is thoroughly backed up by the appropriate literature and is clearly structured and communicated to the readership.

Specific comments: Language: The paper is difficult to understand. The language needs to be improved thoroughly. Particularly, the paper structure needs to be im-

proved.

Literature and significance: The significance of the paper and the proposed index is not clearly explained. The proposed index of the community comprehensive disaster reduction capability (CCDRC) should be presented in a disaster risk management/science context. What is the significance of the CCDRC to the scientific community? How do the findings contribute to relevant literature? How can the results be used to improve disaster risk management? In my opinion, the proposed CCDRC is also highly related to vulnerability and resilience, which have numerous literature including a lot at a community scale. I suggest the authors improve the literature survey and identify the significance of the proposed index and the findings.

Data: Very limited information is given about the data. What are the source, type, reliability, accessibility, and temporal scope of the employed data? What is the spatial size of the study area or the communities?

Methods: The methodology is not well explained. First, the primary and secondary indexes of the CCDRC should be clearly explained. How are the indexes included and structured? Second, what is the relationship between the CCDRC index and the evaluation criteria of the "National demonstration community of comprehensive disaster reduction (NDCCDR)"? What are the reasons that the NDCCDR is imperfect (line 8, 109)? Why the CCDRC and the NDCCDR should be combined (line 25)?

Conclusion: In my opinion, the index-based result can only help to identify relative high or low units but unable to present if the study area is weak or not. I thus disagree with the conclusion that the study area's CCDRC is relatively weak (lines 20–21, 487). It should be confirmed by a comparison between the results of the investigated area with other regions.