Reviewer 1

This article has many major issues. The current version is not qualified for publication.

1.     The Abstract is poorly structured

Authors used too many words to introduce the background, but very few words to show the objectives, methods, results and significances/ implications of this study.

2.     Introduction section does not establish the background of the problem studies. Authors did not provide sufficient background information for readers to understand their study. Authors also did not state what the problems with the existing research are or what is unknown. Most importantly, authors did not explain how their study would address the problems or unknown.

3.     The objectives of this study has not been clearly presented. I suggest authors to list specific objectives one by one.

4.     Scope section. I think this section can be included in the Introduction section following with the Natechs definition.

5.     Material and Methodology section. This section is very confusing, because “3.1 research papers” is the study material and “3.2 questionnaire survey” is a data collection method, and “3.3 Internet search” is neither study material nor a method. The way authors presented here is not clear.

6.     Table 1. It is very difficult to follow the authors’ idea. I suggest to reading some review papers to see the basic format, content and ways of presenting results. Authors may refer to 1) Camila, Suarez-Paba Maria; Mathis, Perreur; Felipe, Munoz; et al. Systematic literature review and qualitative meta-analysis of Natech research in the past four decades. SAFETY SCIENCE Volume: 116   Pages: 58-77 Published: JUL 2019; 2) Da Silva Nascimento, Kayo Renato; Alencar, Marcelo Hazin. Management of risks in natural disasters: A systematic review of the literature on NATECH events. JOURNAL OF LOSS PREVENTION IN THE PROCESS INDUSTRIES Volume: 44   Pages: 347-359 Published: NOV 2016.

7.     Table 2. This table about the legislation authors reviews is not necessary showing in the main contexts. It would be better to be attached as an Appendix.

8.     Legislations in Developed Countries section. Please explain how this section relevant to your study goals? For my understanding, this study is going to evaluate if current Indian laws, regulations, et al. can address Natech risks?  If my understanding is right (the objectives of study has not been clearly presented), it is not necessary to introduce much about Natech legislations in other countries.

9.     Study of Indian Legal Framework Related to Disaster Management section. I think this section is the Results? very confusing!

10. Results and Discussion section. There is Insufficient explanation for the results. Authors should present and illustrate the findings and hopefully discuss the findings by comparing with those of other published results, explaining any discrepancies, unexpected findings and limitations.

11. Conclusion section. The conclusion section should present the most important results and the significance of the work. Try to generalize your findings to the broader situations, such as providing practical application or suggesting future studies, etc.
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Dear Dr. Guru,

Thank you for submitting your article, as listed above, to the International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction.

On the basis of the referees' comments, which are reproduced below, I regret that I cannot accept your manuscript for publication in this journal.

I hope that you can find a more appropriate outlet elsewhere for your work.

Yours sincerely,

Carmine Galasso  
Associate Editor  
International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction

**Comments from the editors and reviewers:**  
-**Reviewer 1**  
  
  - See attached file.  
  
-**Reviewer 2**  
  
  - This paper deals with Natech: an important subject which is nowadays central in the scientific and technological community around the world when dealing with natural hazard-induced risks in crowded countries as Japan or Malesia or India, but also for american (as cited, for the hurricanes) or european countries, mainly for flooding and earthquakes.

However, I think the authors miss completely the real meaning of the word Natech and confuse completely several layer of knowledge, scientific issues, legislation. The aim of the paper, which was clear for the title, has been also missed. The conclusions are actually completely useless.

The word Natech defines the industrial accidents triggered by the impact of a dramatic natural event on an industrial installation or an industrial area. So the analysis should take into account for the normatives, guidelines, standards and procedures adopted by the companies and by the local government (in India) with respect to the natural hazards, to the vulnerability of industrial system with respect to the intensity of the natural event and to the impact of the accidental scenarios produced by the structural failures of the equipment (fire, explosion, toxic dispersion, et cetera) on workers and population.

The paper cannot be accepted