

## ***Interactive comment on “Creative practice as a potential tool to build drought and flood resilience in the Global South” by Anne F. Van Loon et al.***

**Zareen Bharucha**

zareen.bharucha@anglia.ac.uk

Received and published: 20 March 2020

This is a brief log of minor errors I've spotted in this version of the manuscript, and a list of a couple of opportunities for further clarification, if these would be helpful.

1. Change around the order of a and b in the references in these sentences: "Global South communities are vulnerable to the impacts of floods and droughts, and are expected to be even more at risk in the future (Winsemius et al., 2015b), as increased climate variability and is likely to lead to more floods and droughts (IPCC, 2012) and water demands and exposure and vulnerability are growing (Wanders and Wada, 2015; Winsemius et al., 2015a)."

2. Line 30: Can you give a couple of examples of what you mean by creative practice

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



/ processes? At the moment the sentence is also reading a bit circular-ly (if that's a word!) Also might be worth giving an example of artistic artefacts to better illustrate this difference.

3. I'm not familiar with this literature, but in Lines 33 to 40 where you are defining Global South communities would it be worth specifying whether you are meaning marginalised communities (i.e. socioeconomically disadvantaged, spatially distinct 'communities of place', wherever that place might be) or 'rural communities' (which may not all be marginalised - I'm typing this on the train outside Newmarket ;)

4. Line 41 - Maybe in one sentence or even within this one, specify what these critiques are saying (e.g. lack of attention to power relations / diverse knowledges?) Also may be worth expanding a bit on how you're defining resilience?

5. Line 45 - complex interactions

6. Line 76: 'the' audience'?

7. Line 77: 'a' therapeutic way?

8. Lines 170 onwards: I think this is fascinating..so... there is a lot of work beginning to be done, and momentum is building, but we're not sure yet if these methods are really shifting things for people on the ground? A sniff a potential long-term research project, or something looking at long-term outcomes. What changed for participants, how significant was the art practice as a catalyst?

9. BUT having said this in the discussion you touch on there being a lack of effort to do practice that may be used in decision making. Maybe there's a discussion point around the kinds of impact that might be considered worthwhile - things that may have a tangible, immediately discernible impact may not be the ones that catalyse deeper 'transformations' in values for example, and maybe different kinds of interventions are needed for these different 'levels' of change? I'm thinking here of Marina's PhD work (which you heard a bit about yesterday), and her absolute insistence on not claiming

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

particular kinds and directions of change, and 'art' being a relatively unpredictable 'space'. But then her practice is entirely different.

10. Table 1 - what a great resource! This is really helpful for others in the field.

11. Line 190: A space is missing in the first word

12. Line 192: "into in" should be 'into'

13. Line 270: 'It gave us an understanding...'?

14. Line 304: Aha - this is super, and I wonder if it's worth (later in the paper) making it a key point of discussion - there seems to be something there about the practice re-locating agency?

15. Line 328: (Re)specify what this gap is and why it matters?

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-11>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

