

# ***Interactive comment on “Communicating Complex Forecasts for Enhanced Early Warning in Nepal” by Mirianna Budimir et al.***

**Carolina Garcia (Referee)**

cargalon@gmail.com

Received and published: 1 June 2019

The paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of the GC journal. It reflects a multidisciplinary and multi-agency cooperative research on a relevant an actual topic. One of the most interesting contributions of the paper is to analyse the current state of the warning communication among different actors in Nepal. The scientific methods used to compile the information are valid. However, they should be more clearly outlined on regard to the instruments implemented to gather the information. The references quality and number are appropriate. However, there are multiple sentences on the paper that lack a reference, misleading the reader to believe that they correspond to original contributions of the authors. The authors should include some references to support some of the most relevant affirmations of the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



paper, especially in the Introduction and Literature review sections. All the information contained in the Literature Review section is really interesting and reflects a good research work. However, the section is some way extensive, reason why I suggest to reduce the length of it. That will give more predominance to your own research results. The language is fluent and precise. The manuscript structure is clear, although it will be benefit with some content reduction in some sections. Regarding the title, it does not clearly reflect the content of the paper. I would suggest to include a verb related to the action of the research (i.e. analysis, evaluation) and also to include the hazard, since this is quite specific in the research. The results section will be benefit if you include some graphics to facilitate the comprehension of the results by the reader. Following next there are some specific comments, which are further developed in the notes included in the attached file. Since there are multiple concepts of what EWS means (some authors use the concept of EWS, early warning, warning systems, monitoring systems, interchangeably, as if they were the same concept) in some parts of the manuscript is difficult to understand to what concept the authors refer to. For this reason, the authors should state at the beginning of the manuscript what EWS means to them, and then lead the discussion considering the difference between the concept that the authors selected and the concept other authors use. I would be also necessary to include the concept of “Complex Forecast”.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.geosci-commun-discuss.net/gc-2019-3/gc-2019-3-RC1-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2019-3>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

