

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

Nguyet Tran

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This manuscript provides useful and detailed information on disaster vulnerability in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. Particularly, the study applies the Structure, Resource, and Behaviour Change model (SRAB) to explore disaster vulnerability by analyzing the relationship between policy restructuring, resource management changes, and farmer behavior changes. The manuscript is informative and understandable. However, it should be less descriptive and more synthesis/argument should be provided to have a more specific conclusion on the disaster vulnerability. Additionally, choosing a commune in Soc Trang as a case study to draw a general conclusion for the whole region of the Mekong Delta, in this case, is insufficiently convincing.

The following are some specific comments that can be considered for improvement:

Abstract

The abstract is understandable; however, it lacks cohesion between methodology and results. Specifically, the method of SRAB should be mentioned and subsequent research results can be more specific, e.g., degree of vulnerability.

Introduction

The introduction is informative but lacks synthesis because the majority of information is descriptive (e.g., recent disasters), rather than being critically analyzed. The literature review on other research studies is insufficiently comprehensive.

The root cause of disaster vulnerability

The initiation context of this study did not mention the state of research at least in Mekong Delta, especially in relation to the methodology. In other words, the author did not clearly state why they used this methodology.

Methodology

Data and methods: This section is unnecessarily long and descriptive, while lack of synthesis. Detailed data collection and description can be informative but brief and better to be included in the supplementary information (i.e., annex).

Information on how data were processed is insufficient.

Structural Changes: Vietnam's Food Politics and Rice Intensification Policies

Are there any clues proving the changes in the case study?

Changes in Resource Management: Large-scale Water-Control Infrastructure

The Changes in Farming Behaviours

The quotation is unnecessarily included in the text (better in Supplementary Information). Data should be synthesized rather than descriptive.

Discussion

The discussion lacks the cohesion of the analyses between the research methodology, case study, and Mekong Delta. Specifically, how the conclusion on Mekong Delta was drawn from research methodology and case study.

Conclusions

The conclusion is relatively general in terms that it doesn't mention specifically methods applied to the case study, or how results and conclusions were drawn.