

# Review of: "An approach to the background, methods and challenges of research in disasters"

Cristian Camilo Fernández Lopera<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidade de Coimbra

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The manuscript presents a concise and clear analysis with relevant results and conclusions. However, there are some areas that require improvement:

**1. Method Section:** The method should specify the type of bibliographic elements used (e.g., academic literature, gray literature) and the non-bibliographic events. It's essential to clarify how events were accessed and classified, whether chronologically, by topic, by region, etc. Additionally, inclusion and exclusion criteria for both bibliographic and non-bibliographic elements should be explained.

**2. Introduction:** managing the expectations from the beginning is important. It would be beneficial to state at the beginning that this work is not a literature review to avoid misunderstandings.

**3. Results Section:** The term "Natural disaster" is conceptually incorrect and contradicts the theoretical framework cited in the bibliographic review. The modern international framework for disaster studies rejects this term as it shifts the responsibility away from society on the root causes of vulnerability to disasters. Instead, consider using "natural hazards" or "disasters triggered by natural hazards" to improve technical coherence.

**4. Data Sources:** The manuscript mentions databases like Munich Re and EM-DAT but overlooks a relevant regional dataset like DesInventar (<https://www.desinventar.org/>) in the LAC region. It is recommended to include at least a mention of DesInventar.

**5. Table 1:** Some of the information in Table 1 is presented in Spanish, which should be translated into English for consistency.

**6. Disaster Management Model:** The manuscript conceptualizes disasters as a cycle (Table 1), which is one of the main limitations of disaster management and disaster risk management in general. To address this limitation, consider comparing and contrasting the disaster cycle approach with other models, such as the 'Disaster risk management helix' (Aubrecht et al., 2013) and the discussion around different disaster risk management phases presented by Boshier et al. (2021).

- (Aubrecht, C., Ozceylan Aubrecht, D., Klerx, J. and Freire, S. (2013), "Future-oriented activities as a concept for improved disaster risk management", *Disaster Advances*, Vol. 6 No. 12, pp. 1-10.)
- Boshier, L., Chmutina, K. and van Niekerk, D. (2021), "Stop going around in circles: towards a reconceptualisation of

disaster risk management phases", *Disaster Prevention and Management*, Vol. 30 No. 4/5, pp. 525-537.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/DPM-03-2021-0071>

**7. Migration and Displacement:** It would be interesting to see reflections from the authors on the relevance and challenges of the global migratory dynamic resulting from environmental conflicts and climate change for epidemiological research in disasters.