

Review of: "The Consequences of Political and Economic Choices: Exploring Disaster Vulnerability with the Structure, Resource, and Behaviour Change model (SRAB)"

Gill Lawson¹

¹ Lincoln University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Manuscript Details

Title: The Consequences of Political and Economic Choices: Exploring Disaster Vulnerability with the Structure, Resource, and Behaviour Change model (SRAB)

Keywords: agricultural modernisation; behaviours; food politics; infrastructure; resources; structures; Vietnamese Mekong Delta; vulnerability; water-related disaster

Recommendation:

Accept

Minor Revisions

Major Revisions

Reject and Resubmit

Reject

Comments to Author(s)

Thank you for the opportunity to review this article. This article makes a significant contribution to the field of disaster vulnerability. The key point seems to be that national government policies and regional infrastructure development have led to changes in individual farmer behaviour over time. This may have consequences for disaster vulnerability now and in the future, particularly for farmers who are frequently the worst affected by natural hazards.

Introduction – frames the research problem quite well with clear questions that address the causes of disaster vulnerability. However, there is some missing information that appears in the Discussion that could be included here.

Theoretical framework – explains the concept of vulnerability as it relates to the topic of this study. It is a shame that this is not revisited again in the Discussion after having done the work in this paper ie ‘the model considers exposure in a more social way’.

Materials and Methods – why was Tan Hung commune in Soc Trang province selected for the study? There is much information provided about this location but no clear statement as to the reason for this selection. I presume that deltaic provinces in Vietnam and other countries are particularly at risk. If so, this could be explained in the Introduction and revisited in the Discussion. Human ethics approval is commonplace now and does not require detailed explanation. It is however usual practice to de-identify all participants in the study to maintain their privacy and the confidentiality of what they say.

Results – the argument here gets a little confusing. Is ‘Current Farming System and Vulnerability to Natural Disaster’ part of the Results or should it be part of the Methods? It does not seem to use the interview data but relies on published information. If it is based on documentary analysis, this should be explained then in the Methods. The same goes for ‘Structural Changes: Vietnam’s Food Politics and Rice Intensification Policies’ and ‘Changes in Resource Management: Large-scale Water-Control Infrastructure’. Did the participants make any comments about these changes? ‘The Changes in Farming Behaviours’ should retain the same pattern of expression in the heading as the previous two sections eg Behavioural Changes: Shift in Farming Practices. Images of daily life would also add interest for readers.

Discussion – it is mentioned that farmers had opportunities in the 1980s and 1990s to abandon rice farming. Was this mentioned by participants in the study? This is the first that the reader learns of this. Why was this not explained earlier in the paper? Because it did not fit your SRAB model? As mentioned previously, also consider revisiting the concept of vulnerability more generally here.

Conclusion – it is always helpful here to return to the purpose of the study and what was done to investigate the specific topic. How could this study inform a better understanding of disaster vulnerability in deltaic locations in other parts of the world and what further work is still needed?

Overall, this paper presents some interesting findings but needs to improve its flow and clarity to fulfill its potential.