NHERI GSC
May General Meeting

Friday, May 19
11:00am CST
Agenda

12:00-12:10  Welcome & Announcements
12:05-12:15  Review of NHERI GSC Constitution
12:15-12:58  Dr. Tracy Kijewski-Correa
12:58-1:00   Wrap up
Welcome New Members

Anna          Gasha
Prateek       Arora
Vidushi       Toshniwal
Bianka        Pajo
corina        tecu
Vidushi       Toshniwal
Mohammad Faraz Athar

*Reach out to Faith Nenanya and Sasan Dolati to learn how to get involved!
NHERI GSC Mini-Conference

The program and website are **LIVE**!

See the QR Code for the website and program!
NHERI GSC Mini-Conference

Announcing our Keynote Speaker: Dr. Jennifer Irish!

Virginia Tech University, Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Please join us at the inaugural NHERI GSC Mini-Conference!

Friday, May 26, 2023
10:00am-5:00pm CT

Register here!
NHERI GSC Annual Report

We are looking for 2-3 members to join our Annual Report writing group!

The Annual Report will present:
• Membership trends and demographics
• The mission of NHERI GSC
• Membership initiatives and events
• Individual member spotlights and successes
• And more...

If interested, please email theath@sas.upenn.edu by Wednesday, May 24!
NHERI GSC NSF Proposal

NHERI GSC is working on a proposal for NSF!

For more information or to get involved, contact Treasure Elliot Nichols (enichols9@gatech.edu) or Vice Treasurer Nurullah Bektas (nurullahbektas@hotmail.com)!
Proposed Changes to the NHERI GSC Constitution

• Aligning current executive position descriptions with their actual responsibilities (Officers, Chairs, and Vice Chairs)

• Changes to existing Working Group structure
  – Current Working Groups would have a Chair and Vice Chair and work as officers without Working Group Membership
  – New research-based Working Groups would be created and facilitated by a newly created leadership position-NHERI GSC Research Representatives
Proposed Changes to the NHERI GSC Constitution

• A proposed draft of the revised NHERI GSC Constitution will be available for public comment by Monday, June 5.

• Following public comment, the revised NHERI GSC Constitution must be approved by the entire body to take effect.

• Voting will take place 6/19-6/26 via Qualtrics.
Academic Publishing Workshop

JUNE 9th
1:00 pm CT

NHERI presents
GSC
Academic Publishing Workshop

With Speakers:

Jack Baker, PhD
Professor of Civil & Environmental Engineering
Editor-in-Chief of Earthquake Spectra

Natalie Coleman
NSF Graduate Research Fellow
Texas A&M

Amer Hamad Issa Abukhalaf
PhD Candidate
University of Florida

Jack Baker
Stanford University

Natalie Coleman
Texas A&M University

Amer Hamad Issa Abukhalaf
University of Florida
Speaker Introduction

Dr. Tracy Kijewski-Correa
Professor of Engineering and Global Affairs
Co-Director, Integration Lab
William J. Pulte Director (acting), Pulte Institute for Global Development

tkijewsk@nd.edu
Navigating Reviewer Feedback
Tracy Kijewski-Correa
University of Notre Dame
Roadmap for Today’s Conversation

- Part I: Know Thyself
- Part II: Offense is the best defense
- Part III: Plan your attack and attack your plan
- Part IV: Keep growing
PART I: 
Know Your Tendances and Support Yourself
Preliminaries: We think we are better than we are
Preliminaries: Women take feedback to heart (too much?)

After Getting Critical Feedback, Women Are Quicker to Revise Their Opinions of Themselves

Based on surveys given to 221 MBA students during a year of group study.

[Graph showing data]
Preliminaries: Negative Feedback Requires Confidence

**IT TAKES CONFIDENCE TO RECEIVE NEGATIVE FEEDBACK**

- **PREFERS NEGATIVE FEEDBACK**
  - Bottom 10%: 1.32
  - Next 25%: 3.58
  - Middle 30%: 4.63
  - Next 25%: 6.21
  - Top 10%: 6.39

- **AVOIDS NEGATIVE FEEDBACK**

**SOURCE** Zenger/Folkman

HBR.ORG
Preliminaries: It takes time to thicken skin
INFPs are rather sensitive individuals, and because of this they truly dislike criticism. In most cases, they are their own worst critic.

ESTJs strive to be accomplished and because of this, they work hard to avoid criticism. The ESTJ will push themselves to be the best they can at whatever they are doing. To the ESTJ, if they are being criticized, it means they didn’t do it right the first time. This will often frustrate them…

Preliminaries: Your personality type likely dictates your response
PART II.
Offense is the best defense
1. Requirements, elements and limits

2. Outline core messages by section
   - 1. Requirements, elements and limits

3. Map evidence base (literature, results)

4. Build narrative and verify flow

KNOW THE AUDIENCE: Find exemplar papers from your chosen journal

KNOW YOUR REVIEWERS: Identify and justify assumptions or claims that challenge papers you cite
“This is the Curse of Knowledge. Once we know something, we find it hard to imagine what it was like not to know it. Our knowledge has “cursed” us. And it becomes difficult for us to share our knowledge with others, because we can’t readily re-create our listeners’ state of mind.”

--Made to Stick by Chip and Dan Heath
| Simplicity | ● FIND THE CORE MESSAGE  
          ● *Perfection is not when there is nothing left to add, but when there is nothing left to take away* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unexpectedness</td>
<td>● Two essential emotions to establish novelty: surprise and interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Concreteness | ● Be careful: it’s easy to slip into “abstract speak”  
                      ● How can examples, applications, and case studies be used as illustrative tools?  
                      ● How can visuals communicate complex frameworks and theories? |
| Credibility | ● Literature  
                      ● Established measures, benchmarks, verification and validation processes  
                      ● Robustness checks (build your Supplemental Materials as you write) |
| Emotional Stories | ● Three strategies for making people care: using associations, appealing to self-interest, and appealing to identity *(INSPIRES CARE)* |
PART III.
Plan your attack and attack your plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>● Did you fulfill and comply with all Author Guidelines?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>● Was paper’s organization and logic well-articulated and concise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>● Do you provide sufficient evidence to support your claims both of the problem as well as the necessity for your approach and its contribution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td>● Do you select examples or applications that illustrate the salient points and key contributions of your work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion</td>
<td>● Did sections appropriately integrate, cross-reference and reinforce? Or do they contradict, redundant, disconnected? Were you consistent terminology, notation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Classes of Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Obvious</th>
<th>The Misdirected</th>
<th>The Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Direct edits</td>
<td>● Misunderstandings</td>
<td>● Clarifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Grammar</td>
<td>● Oversights</td>
<td>● Reorganization, restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Spelling</td>
<td>● Confusion</td>
<td>● Minor additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Puzzling**
- ● Contradictory or confusing comments
- ● Comments not linked to specific sections/elements
- ● Comments that seem disconnected from study
# My Process for Responding to Reviewers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set Up File Environment</th>
<th>Triage Feedback</th>
<th>Initiate Action</th>
<th>Sustain Action</th>
<th>Finalize</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Map reviewer and editor comments into Response to Reviewer grid with comment IDs</td>
<td>- Score by degree of difficulty or lead time</td>
<td>PATH 1: Act on low-hanging fruits to build momentum and confidence</td>
<td>- Craft responses in parallel with MS edits</td>
<td>- Review responses for clarity and tone (pick battles and exercise humility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create copies of relevant files to track changes in editing</td>
<td>- Outline preliminary strategy</td>
<td>PATH 2: Start long lead-time items, e.g., expanded literature review or additional results</td>
<td>- Drop comments in MS to label actions taken by comment ID</td>
<td>- Verify line numbers, page number are cross-referenced accurately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish timeline</td>
<td>- Delegate to co-authors as relevant</td>
<td>- Seek clarification from editorial team</td>
<td>- Cross-reference common queries</td>
<td>- Secure co-author sign off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seek clarification from editorial team</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Track progress (red, yellow, green system)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Evolution of My Response (I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response to Reviewer #2</th>
<th>R2.8</th>
<th>R2.9</th>
<th>R2.10</th>
<th>R2.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **R2.8**: Consider how the perceived benefit of different mitigation measures compares to objective historical analysis of how beneficial these measures have been in practice.

  - NIBS Study -- they are 10:1, but no one waits for the payout; efficacy is high. We can tweak language and say we addressed concern.

- **R2.9**: Relate finding that only 1 of 5 found home market value benefits from mitigation measures to finding on page 17 that market value only important, efficacy not significant?

  - The reviewer seems unfamiliar with statistics. You can have a low probability outcome that is statistically significant in its relationship to other outcomes. Need to finesse a reply that does not insult reviewer -- perception, people are not logical.

- **R2.10**: Clarify what we mean by inexpensive flood mitigation measures compared to the 'major structural' mitigations. Please make clearer.

  - Cross reference cost of upgrades, give examples of flood mitigation measures used in other studies of perception

- **R2.11**: Discuss universal application of finding about risk communication (i.e., stop talking about avoided future losses)

  - Best comment. Totally agree that this sells the paper and should be promoted more prominently, especially if we have any citations relevant to other places or other hazards. Hit harder in discussion, conclusions, introduction. World Bank, Sendai, UNDP
## Evolution of My Response (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R2.5</th>
<th>P. 9 line 3: ‘mandated insurance credits’: what does this mean? Is this a subsidy on insurance premiums provided by the state? Or something else. Please clarify.</th>
<th>Tracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State laws require an insurance premium reduction when homes employ hurricane-adaptive features; the lost revenue resulting from this discount is not directly recouped by the insurer from any state or federal subsidy. We have revised the text to clarify.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.6</td>
<td>P. 10 lines 3 - 6: While ‘market value’ is a ‘short term’ benefit, it would be interesting to know if the authors considered any other short term benefits. It is noted in the conclusion that there could be co-benefits connecting hurricane mitigation and energy efficiency, but are there other more immediate benefits that a short-term, high discount rate household could realise?</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The work has thus far focused only on the short-term benefits that could be easily realized within the existing markets surrounding housing, notably insurance and real estate. Co-benefits (bundling with investments that increase energy efficiency and thereby address climate adaptation and mitigation jointly) were not explicitly examined by the survey in North Carolina, but definitely worthy of future study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.7</td>
<td>P. 11 line 8: given this is 5 years ago, it would be worth discussing a lateral study to see if perceptions may have changed and why.</td>
<td>Debra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DJ to TKC: Let’s wait on my crafting a response here, because I think we can do so in the context of the generalizability discussion. That is, we can say something about findings applying in other places and times. I can wordsmith better after seeing exactly what we end up doing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.8</td>
<td>Pages 13 - 14: It would be interesting to understand how the perceived benefit of different mitigation measures compares to objective historical analysis of how beneficial these measures have been in practice.</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the new section on “The Coastal US Context” and in “Results,” we cite a major study that monetized the benefit of these measures in practice, relative to their cost to demonstrate that the perceptions of efficacy are indeed in line with objectively quantified benefits (“10-to-1 return on investment with respect to avoided losses (MMC, 2019)”).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.3</td>
<td>A further comment related to the U.S. domestic focus, as Climate Policy is an international journal it would be useful to go through the paper and clarify where geographic names and policies may need further description. E.g., p. 4 lines 6 - 8: ‘Fair Access to Insurance Requirements (FAIR)’ is this a Federal requirement, and what does it require briefly?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for the excellent suggestion, as we obviously would not want to alienate readers with unfamiliar geographic names and policies. Given the limited space, we remove reference to US-specific policy instruments like FAIR and some of the details of the US insurance industry that are not critical to our analysis or argument. Instead, we attempt to contextualize the problem more generally. We also preface specific geographies to make it clear that these are US states.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.4</td>
<td>P. 4 lines 15 - 20. It wasn’t clear what were ‘these state insurance pools’, please clarify what ‘these’ are?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These refer to the state-administered insurance programs that were instituted in US coastal states after private insurers left the market, restructuring of the introduction hopefully clarifies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.5</td>
<td>P. 9 line 3: ‘mandated insurance credits’: what does this mean? Is this a subsidy on insurance premiums provided by the state? Or something else. Please clarify.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State laws require an insurance premium reduction when homes employ hurricane-adaptive features; the lost revenue resulting from this discount is not directly recouped by the insurer from any state or federal subsidy. We have revised the text to clarify.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2.6</td>
<td>P. 10 lines 3 - 6: While ‘market value’ is a ‘short term’ benefit, it would be interesting to know if the authors considered any other short term benefits. It is noted in the conclusion that there could be co-benefits connecting hurricane mitigation and energy efficiency, but are there other more immediate benefits that a short-term, high discount rate household could realise?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The authors’ body of work has thus far focused only on the economic benefits that could be easily realized within the existing markets surrounding housing, notably insurance and real estate. Co-benefits (bundling with investments that increase energy efficiency and thereby address climate adaptation and mitigation jointly) were not explicitly examined by the survey in North Carolina, but definitely worthy of future study. We also modify the language in the discussion to explicitly introduce the term “co-benefits”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART IV: Keep growing
How can I continue to grow?

- Ask advisors/mentors if you can see the Response to Reviewers for your most harshly reviewed paper(s)
- Practice critiquing the writings of others, e.g., shadow review, peer editing, mock reviews
- Use **pro-con grids** when arguing for your approach’s novelty against those established in the literature
- Keep a running list of your biggest assumptions, limitations and concerns and argue your way through them
- Practice **gratitude framing**, in general, and especially in critiques (even the most resistant colleagues often admit feedback strengthened the final MS)
Future Meeting Dates

3rd Friday of every month at 11:00am CST

*Register to join us for NHERI GSC Mini-Conference on Friday, May 26th, and the Academic Publishing Workshop with Jack Baker on Friday, June 9th.