

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Devastating 'DANA' Floods in Valencia: Insights on Resilience, Challenges, and Strategies Addressing Future Disasters

Policy Brief, Public Health Rev.

Reviewer: Henrique Lopes

Submitted on: 17 Feb 2025

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2025.1608297

EVALUATION

Q 1 What are the main findings and conclusions reported in this manuscript?

The article is very interesting and draws attention to the increase in climate risks, as well as the need to pay greater attention to preparing and increasing the resilience of emergency response systems.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and advantages.

The article could be greatly improved by presenting a methodology section that clarifies the origin of the suggestions for future action. It should explain whether the recommendations presented are the result of personal readings by the authors, whether they formed a group of experts on the subject and what they present is a consensus of this reflection, and what the prior skills of the experts/authors are to pronounce themselves on such a multifaceted subject. The article is thus between the position paper and the technical recommendation. Clarifying this aspect would be important.

Although these are common sense suggestions and anyone involved in science can accept them without resistance, they lack technical basis, e.g. has recommendation X already been applied elsewhere? with what results, what homologous solutions do science and technology have for homologous situations? How do the recommended suggestions play with the dominant theories in civil protection sciences that cover such aspects?

Q 3 Are there objective errors or fundamental flaws? If yes, please detail your concerns.

While it is not a fundamental error, it is a clear limitation: It was also not clear whether these will be priority recommendations or whether, in the authors' opinion, they cover all the major analytical dimensions. It would be interesting to compare this point with the risk-impact theory that guides all civil protection action in Europe.

Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Does the manuscript provide an appropriate context for a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Does the manuscript use language that can be understood by a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Is the quality of figures and/or tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Is the evidence presented appropriate, sound and objective?

Yes.

Are the action points provided based on the evidence?

Yes.

Are the action points provided reasonable and feasible?

Yes.

Are there any ethical issues with the recommendations provided?

No.

Q 5 ➤ Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

In my understanding, resolving the above points can greatly improve an article that is located in a field where public health is very fragile and strong scientific production is needed.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 6 ➤ Originality	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐
Q 7 ➤ Rigor	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐
Q 8 ➤ Significance to the field	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Q 9 ➤ Interest to a general audience	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Q 10 ➤ Quality of the writing	☒	☒	☒	☒	☒
Q 11 ➤ Overall quality of the study	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐

REVISION LEVEL

Q 12 ➤ Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.