

Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-638-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Comment on hess-2021-638

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "To which extent are socio-hydrology studies truly integrative? The case of natural hazards and disaster research" by Franciele Maria Vanelli et al., Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2021-638-RC1>, 2022

The authors conducted a systematic review of the literature on natural hazards and disaster within sociohydrology. The paper identifies trends and gaps in the literature and proposes some ways to address existing issues. The paper is well written, concise, and clear. It also provides some useful visual aids for those who want to get a glimpse in the current state of the art. I particularly appreciate the proposed shift from an interdisciplinary state to a transdisciplinary state. In my opinion, the paper can be accepted upon minor revision. While I am not necessarily against its publication in HESS, I believe the paper would fit NHESS better, considering its focus, but I leave this to the handling editor.

Here below some minor points:

- I would leave percentages out of the abstract (not wrong to have them, just a style suggestion)
- The authors use the affiliation as a proxy for the discipline to which a certain author belongs. I understand the reasoning behind this and I agree this is one way of doing it. However, nowadays an increasing number of researchers find themselves employed by a department which doesn't (partially or fully) reflect their expertise, especially with the rise of interdisciplinary projects that get funded and the consequent interdisciplinarity of teams where people with very different expertise end up working in the same department. I think a better way to deal with this would be to look at the publication record of each author (but extremely time consuming). I am not saying the authors should do this now, but I would refer to this limitation somewhere in the paper (e.g. in methods).

- p.9 line 204: it is not entirely clear what is meant with temporal series of social data, could the authors maybe shortly elaborate on that?
- p.15 line 332: in my opinion, droughts so far have received little attention for two reasons. The first one is that the field of sociohydrology was "initiated" by hydrologist who have mostly focused on floods throughout their career. The second one concerns the characteristic of a drought, e.g. more complex phenomenon, larger spatial scale and longer temporal scale, cross-country impacts, etc., which make it more challenging to study even more so when coupled to the human component. Maybe this can also be briefly discussed in the paper.
- p.15 line 334, "all types of disasters can be considered as socio-hydrological phenomena as they are directly and/or indirectly associated with water". I am not sure I agree with this, as I don't see the connection between, for example, earthquakes and water (unless they trigger a tsunami) or volcanic eruptions and water.

Technical corrections:

- p.2 line 60: the main objective of this study *is*
- p.5 line 117: I would cite the article you mention here (I believe Sivapalan, Savenije, and Blöschl 2012?)
- p.7 line 171: what do the authors mean with "one-person household", is it "one person per household"?