

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-31-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on gc-2021-31

Anonymous Referee #2

Referee comment on "Development of forecast information for institutional decision-makers: landslides in India and cyclones in Mozambique" by Mirianna Budimir et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-31-RC2>, 2021

The paper highlights and responds to a gap in research on the **process** of developing forecast bulletins for decision-makers i.e. professional, institutional users. It includes many practical and helpful insights from the process, as examined in two different cases.

Some comments and suggestions are given below:

Context: Consider using diagrams/figures to concisely convey the various flows of information and stakeholder relationships (Users, Intermediaries and Producers) for clarity.

Methodology: The choice of cases appears to be fairly pragmatic and the methodology would benefit from further explanation and justification of the choice and the implications for the subsequent analysis.

Results: A strength is the level of detail and granularity provided in the results section. Giving specific examples, for example the choice of words or colours, transparently allows the reader to see into the process of co-production and development of bulletins and means that these insights are not lost in over-generalisation. However, I think that consistency and signposting of when you are writing about which case and the similarities and differences, could be improved for clarity. Consider whether summary tables could be helpful.

Second paragraph of 5.3 Information vs. advice - seems to be more about complexity. Is this a theme in itself?

Considerations: This more discursive section aims to bring together insights from the results for others developing forecasts and bulletins for natural hazards. A topic of importance that I feel is not adequately addressed is that of accountability - who (among all stakeholders - producers, intermediaries and users) is ultimately accountable for the information provided and its impacts? And how has this been considered throughout the bulletin development process?