

Reviewer Comments to Author

The manuscript "*Disaster Management Following the Great Kahramanmaraş Earthquakes in 2023, Türkiye*", from B. Sari deals with the analysis of information communicated by AFAD during crisis management generated by the 2023 seismic sequence. The use case is of great interest to the field of disaster risk reduction, and is coherent with the editorial line of NHESS.

While the scientific approach of "qualitative research" is interesting and seems to be scrupulously followed by the author, the specific results of the study remain under-exploited. In addition, the choice of analyzing only information from AFAD's official communication via status updates and posts on social networks is highly questionable, insofar as in crisis management situations, official communication is not always very transparent, and its content is often oriented to emphasize the positive aspects of the authorities' intervention.

As a result, the discussion and conclusion chapters are far too vague and poorly justified to have a real scientific impact. In particular, it is necessary to:

- Have a better presentation of the raw data used in the study, with more precise details of how they were obtained, as well as their descriptive presentation;
- Complement this more detailed presentation of data by comparing it with more contextual information coming from other studies or press releases, to highlight key moments, nuance AFAD's communications, etc. This would make it possible to draw real conclusions, rather than just formulate vague hypotheses...

I therefore suggest to the Editor to accept the publication of the article after major revisions, while I encourage the author to rework their article thoroughly before resubmitting it. To this end, I give some advices to the authors in the attachment.

General comments

1. Better present the raw data used in the study, with more precise details on how they were obtained, together with an in-depth descriptive analysis. In addition, justify the decision to consider only the official AFAD communication, which gives an oriented view of crisis management by the authorities.
2. Formulation of scientific questions (section 3.2): Either replace the term "Turkish government" with "AFAD", or consider in the study other data sources that allow other government sources to be taken into account as a complement to AFAD (e.g. <https://www.middleeasteye.net/big-story/turkey-earthquake-response-what-went-wrong>).
3. The discussion chapter (section 5) draws only slightly on the results of the study (section 4). Thus, section 5 is essentially a discussion of generalities already well known in crisis management, with no critical analysis of AFAD's communication elements.

On the contrary, some of the "results" highlighted are of little interest. For example, it is stated that AFAD issued press releases on average every 3 hours, and tweets every 50 minutes (p. 12, l.261-262). After this very brief mention of the results of the data analysis conducted in section 4, there follows a twenty-line discussion that looks more like a literature review, and in which there is not once a reference to the specific case of the 2023 earthquakes...

The paragraph on the contribution of social networks to crisis management (p14-15, l339-358) is another example of the poor construction of section 5, since the analysis of tweets posted by AFAD does not really support this paragraph, particularly as regards the monitoring of social networks by the authorities for situational awareness purposes.

This is highly problematic, and highlights both the lack of significant results and the lack of exploitation of these results. This section 5 needs to be rewritten in its entirety, after strengthening section 4, and attempting to draw specific lessons from the 2023 earthquakes (i.e. not just illustrating results from other previous studies).

Conclusion (section 6): In its current wording, section 6 does not at all answer the research questions formulated in section 3.2. It is essential that this be the case. I think it would be important, for example, to cite the study by Platt and Drinkwater (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2016.03.010>), which in 2016 highlighted AFAD's inability to anticipate the long term during crisis management, and to answer the question of whether this criticism has been confirmed or invalidated in 2023?

4. References:
 - Standardize the way references are cited.
 - When the authors of a study are used as the subject of a sentence, add the year in parentheses and delete the duplicate reference at the end of the sentence (e.g. sentence in p.12, l.265-267: "Jones et al. (2017) argued ..."

Specific comments

- P.1, l.9: What does "purposive sampling" mean? Do not introduce this technical term in the abstract, or explain it briefly. This term should also be made clearer in section 3.
- P.3, l.85: choose a more convincing reference to illustrate the point than the one from Mendoza et al.
- P.3, l86-89: The sentence about the value and flexibility of USAR teams is strange, because it reduces the operational management of rescue operations to the sole issue of "search and rescue".
- P.4, l.94: The title of section 2 is catchy, but not suitable for a scientific article. Change it.

- P.4, l.95-96: Change the reference to a scientific source rather than that of the Turkish government.
- P.4, l.101: missing reference to EM-DAT in bibliography
- P.4, l.104: In the legend to figure 1, replace the word "earthquake" with "seismic"
- P.4, l.105: replace the term "fault lines" with "fault systems"
- P.4, l.108: the term "tremor" is very specific to certain types of seismic event. Replace by "seismic sequence »
- P.4, l.110-111: The last sentence isn't very clear and needs rewording, as it's not clear which earthquake event was ultimately the most destructive.
- P.5, l.116-117: indicate that the underwater landslide caused a small tsunami
- P.5, l.123: "dismantling structures that pose a hazard" -> incomprehensible wording to be reformulated
- P.6, l.138-140: "Plain reinforcement [...] ground movement" -> incomprehensible wording to be reformulated
- P.6, l.152 : ref. to Patton, 2015 is lacking in the bibliography
- P.7, l.177-183: The table must be clearly referenced with a number and a legend.
- P.8, figure 2: This figure takes up a lot of space but doesn't import much information. A time histogram would probably be more informative.
- P.8, l.202 to p.9, l.209: I don't understand why this discussion about publication times and frequency is interesting??? It's a description that doesn't do much for the reader.
- P.9, figure 3: remove the 1st mention of the source, in bold text
- P.10, figure 4: It's unfortunate that the way in which the "tag" categories shown in Figure 4 are not presented and discussed in detail in the article, as this is the author's real work. What's more, this classification is highly debatable, and therefore needs to be justified: it's strange, for example, to see the "shelter & meal" category appear at the same level as the "response" category?
- P.11, figure 5: A word cloud doesn't add much to a scientific article, because it's only illustrative. A more in-depth analysis is needed (e.g. different timelines counting the number of mentions of each code over time).
- P.12, l285-289: The discussion on the capacity of INSARAG teams needs to be revisited. In particular, the estimated need for 1.5 million USAR personnel means nothing at all, since each team investigates many buildings during its mission (HUSAR teams can even manage two buildings at the same time).
- P.13, l.290-306: This discussion doesn't add up to much, and the reader doesn't really understand what it's for. ...
- P.14, l.323-331: Interesting discussion, but absolutely not supported by the data ... which raises a serious problem.
- P.15, section « Conclusion »: The conclusion does not do enough to highlight the author's work, and is far too complacent towards the Turkish authorities. For example, line 369 states that the commitment of the volunteers was remarkable: this is true, but in an article dealing with the coordination of crisis management, the difficulty of coordinating such a surge of solidarity should be emphasized.