I agree with R1 – the paper is written in much better English than my Italian, but it is hard to read and in places the style is colloquial/journalistic rather than academic. I have done a quick read-through with some other points to note but will review it in more detail after a rewrite. I also agree with R1 that there is much excellent material here and strongly encourage the author to persevere with it!

Other points:

How do we know that people were so attracted to the area by the volcanoes? There are lots of highly populated non-volcanic areas in the region. There are comments throughout like this – that make value judgements with limited evidence – e.g. page 5 has quite a simplistic reading of culture as sequential.

LI47-48 Not really an academic comment!

LI61 onwards – not always necessary (or indeed possible) to quantify vulnerability – vulnerability needs to be dealt with in different ways. Quantification can help but is not the only approach. The primary drivers of vulnerability may be socio-economic, cultural and political, and so policy changes and reducing social inequality are more important than measuring vulnerability itself.

On the C17th, there is a useful book by Sean Cocco


L281: whether or not it was “overcautious” to evacuate Pozzuoli depends also on the uncertainty – it is not just about what happened, but what could have happened – if the uncertainty is high, the evacuation may be justified anyway.

Some of the information in this section (historical activity of CF) could be displayed in a timeline, which would be helpful for readers unfamiliar with the events. The existing figures are very good – would just be useful to have a timeline of the more recent crises/unrest too.