

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-260-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

An excellent contribution

Anonymous Referee #2

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-RC2>, 2021

It was great to review this sobering and much-needed article. I really enjoyed reading and think the discussion is well written. I have 3 major comments that need to be addressed before publication.

- It is not clear who the target group of the survey was. How was the sampling strategy? Newsletter? Existing networks? Twitter? How many people were invited? It is not clear why only women replied. Did the survey target only women? If this is the case, what are the reasons for excluding men from the survey? Please add this information to the methodology session.
- I am not entirely convinced about having the category "main challenges on NH research" discussion on pages 4 to 5. It is out of the scope of the paper. I think it would be better if you linked the identified challenges to gender and diversity issues. It is currently not in the main objectives. Yet, it gets much focus, mainly because it is the first topic you write about. I would consider adding this as one of the paper's goals or toning it down and linking it more with gender/diversity (like it is done on page 6). Especially the part regarding forecasting problems, data quality, etc. are disconnected from the paper objectives. I understand how relevant and exciting these results are and that you want to show them, but as a reader I felt it belonged to another paper.
- I suggest adding figures with the most common challenges and solutions mentioned by the participants. Also, since you have lots of text data, you could consider making a graph with the most cited terms or even a word cloud.

Specific comments

Line 17: It would be better to explain here how Zaidi and Fordham (2021) achieved these

findings. Sure, one can always look at the original source, but if you put the information here it is easier for the reader. It could be something like this: "By examining xxx and xxx data, Zaidi and Fordham (2021) found out that the SFDRR....)

Line 29: what is meant here by "(referred to the journal)"?

Line 34: There are studies that show that actually men are more affected because of their risk-taking behavior when facing disasters. This is true in some European countries. However, I agree that this kind of binary logic doesn't help much DRR research.

Line 41: Could you enumerate some of these challenges? The sentence is a bit vague

Line 48: You can remove EU Survey from here, as it is explained in detail later.

Figure 1 is too small to read. What were the criteria for including categories here? For instance, only things mentioned by 5 people were included? What guided this analysis? It would be interesting to know how many people support each category and which ones were less mentioned.

Fig 1: how many people answered that gender is not a problem? It would be good to have a paragraph with the arguments used by these participants. I would be interested in seeing their demographics. Have you considered applying statistical analysis to your outcomes to see if there are group differences? Or the sample is too small for this?

Line 84: Samwise?

Line 155-156: Again, please bring here articles that show the opposite: men are more affected in some cases. Here some possible examples, but there are many more.

- Wachinger, O. Renn, C. Begg, C. Kuhlicke, The risk perception paradox-implications for governance and communication of natural hazards, *Risk Anal.* 33 (2013) 1049–1065. doi:10.1111/j.1539-6924.2012.01942.x.

S.. Cutter, J. Tiefenbacher, W.D. Solecki, En-gendered fears: femininity and technological risk perception, in: S.L. Cutter (Ed.), *Hazards Vulnerability Environ. Justice, Earthscam,*

New York, 2006: pp. 177–192.

S.T. Ashley, W.S. Ashley, Flood fatalities in the United States, *J. Appl. Meteorol. Climatol.* 47 (2008) 805–818. doi:10.1175/2007JAMC1611.1.

- Fitzgerald, W. Du, A. Jamal, M. Clark, X.Y. Hou, Flood fatalities in contemporary Australia (1997-2008): Disaster medicine, *EMA - Emerg. Med. Australas.* 22 (2010) 180– 186. doi:10.1111/j.1742-6723.2010.01284.x.

S.N. Jonkman, I. Kelman, An analysis of the causes and circumstances of flood disaster 27 deaths. *Disasters.* 29 (2005) 75–97. doi:10.1111/j.0361-3666.2005.00275.x

These articles could also be helpful for discussing your results:

- <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2212420921004568>
- <https://gh.bmj.com/content/6/4/e004377.abstract>

Line 157: It would be good if you could back up these statements with concrete examples and empirical research results. Otherwise, it is too vague.

Line 169-172: This is a very good point

Line 220: Did the participants have the option to choose different solutions? Or it was an open-ended question? Please make this clear in the methods section. It would be good to have a graph with the most cited measures/solutions

Line 226: Are these results consistent with previous literature? Are there any similarities? If there is no research on gender in NH research, you can perhaps compare with other fields (e.g. mathematics) and see if the problems/solutions are somehow similar or if there is something unique for NH research

Line 235: again, it would be helpful to have a graph with the most common challenges cited by participants.