

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-260-RC1>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Comment on nhess-2021-260

Anonymous Referee #1

---

Referee comment on "Invited perspectives: "Natural hazard management, professional development and gender equity: let's get down to business"" by Valeria Cigala et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-260-RC1>, 2021

---

In this perspective piece, the authors present and discuss the challenges related to gender within the natural hazards field on the bases of survey data. First of all, I want to congratulate the authors on this extremely relevant and well written piece. The article touches upon many issues around gender always in a critical way, which is what I appreciate the most about the piece. In my opinion, this article should be accepted for publication in NHESS almost as is, but there is one clarification needed (which could play a rather large role for the meaning of this paper):

- Was the survey aimed at women *and* men or only women? If both but only women replied, what does this tell us? If this is the case, I believe this is an extremely important point that should be discussed in the paper: e.g. why men did not take part in the survey? What could be the reasons? If it was only aimed at women, what were the reason? Could there be a risk of losing data on how men perceive (or don't perceive) this issue? I think then, in such case, this should be discussed. I am asking this because in p.2, line 46 it says "opinions of *individuals* working in the broad field of natural hazards"
- In relation to the former point, how was the survey advertised? I think a few lines about this would help clarify the first point

**Minor points:**

- It may be that I couldn't find it, but it seems the abstract is missing (could only find the short summary)
- 1 line 19: I think it should be "... gender-based issues in DRR (even beyond ...)"
- 2 lines 30-31: this sentence needs referencing
- 2 line 33: I think this was actually discussed broadly also by Finucane et al. (2010), and more recently by Mondino et al. (2021)
- 2 line 38: "non-technical" articles: do you mean articles in the social sciences sphere? Or articles that use qualitative as opposed to quantitative approaches?
- 2 line 56: I think this is a great approach to this type of data analysis!
- 2 line 57: related to the first "major" point: was gender asked in the survey?
- 4 line 84: "Samwise" do you mean "similarly"?
- 7 lines 167-168: I think this sentence needs a reference
- 7 line 200: "cognitive and experiential [...?]" I think a word is missing
- 8 line 222: "aroused by" should be "brought up by"
- 9 line 238: "unbalance" should be "imbalance"

#### References:

- Finucane, M. L., Slovic, P., Mertz, C. K., Flynn, J., & Satterfield, T. A. (2010). Gender, race, and perceived risk: The 'white male' effect. *Health, Risk & Society*, 2(2), 159–172, <https://doi.org/10.1080/713670162>
- Mondino, E., Scolobig, A., Borga, M., and Di Baldassarre, G. (2021). Longitudinal survey data for diversifying temporal dynamics in flood risk modelling, *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci.*, 21, 2811–2828, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-21-2811-2021>

#### **Personal opinion(s)**

I would like to use this space to voice some of my personal opinions on the matter. These are not meant to influence the perspective piece in any way, but just to further discuss this relevant and (unfortunately) timely issue. While in general I agree with most strategies proposed in this perspective and in the other articles mentioned in Table 2, I find it hard to agree with the fact that "providing female-specific funding and support" is a good way forward. I am afraid this can very quickly turn into a double-edged sword, as in "she got that funding because it was women-only funding". Such approach in my opinion would (maybe partly) address the symptoms, but without actually curing the disease. What we need in terms of funding, in my opinion, are evaluation panels that are diverse, that are held accountable, and that are trained. I have a similar opinion around quotas, which the authors also mention in their piece. Quotas are indeed controversial, and I found myself discussing their pros and cons many times with female and male colleagues. My personal opinion is that quotas can be detrimental to a woman credibility if she's put there because of quotas. Obviously, this would not be the case all the time, but it's definitely something that can be used against her at any point. I don't think it is worth the

risk. At the same time, during discussions with colleagues, another point was brought up, i.e. that the “forced” presence of women through quotas can help normalise and promote gender balance within decision bodies. To be fair, I believe this entails a lot of wishful thinking and optimism.

In terms of motherhood support, I couldn’t exactly understand what is meant by it in the paper, but again I believe that it’s not only about “supporting motherhood” but rather “normalising fatherhood”, even better so “parenthood”. In my opinion, the intrinsic issue here is that, in most countries, parenthood seems to be a female-only prerogative. Now this would be one of the rare cases in which I would support a sort of “forcing”, as in forcing both parties (i.e. both parents) to take an equal amount of parental leave, for example. I say I support this because I’ve seen it working in countries such as Sweden, where parental leave (maternal *and* paternal) is absolutely normalised.

Anyway, these were just two points that I felt like would be an interesting discussion-starter, and I hope the community will start discussing this seriously. Eventually, it is not about “making it easier” for women, it is about “not making it harder”.