

Interactive comment on “Assessment of Social Vulnerability to Natural Hazards in Nepal” by Dipendra Gautam

D. Gautam

strdyn@yahoo.com

Received and published: 21 August 2017

Dear reviewer,

Thanks for your time to review the manuscript and notable comments. I will be revising the language in the revised version. Your concerns would be addressed as below in the revised manuscript:

1. Social vulnerability analysis is kind of package consideration rather than post-eq scenario and multiple disasters are considered while analyzing. It is the dissemination of holistic scenario rather than focusing on the single event. In order to incorporate the post-eq scenario, the seismic risk/vulnerability would be better and I have disseminated other papers related to such aspects too. Apart from this, climate change is the cause

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



of a disaster and this study is the effect study only. The overall scenario is presented in social vulnerability irrespective of a particular event. You have raised a strong concern of multi-hazards risk assessment, and I am working on that. Meanwhile, a multi-risk analysis is not the scope of this paper.

2. I will opt to provide some criticisms (synthesis) considering your suggestions. 3. The vulnerability formula is well known and the reference is provided. One of the references in the text shows that three different techniques to estimate the vulnerability scores do not lead to variation, thus the generalized one is used in this study. 4. Your comment is noted. But scoring based vulnerability mapping does not exist to the best of my knowledge. I will update and amend the sentence when necessary.

Thank you!

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-137>, 2017.