

## ***Interactive comment on “European education on natural disasters – a textbook study” by B. Komac et al.***

**A. Steinführer (Editor)**

annett.steinfuehrer@vti.bund.de

Received and published: 7 July 2013

Dear colleagues,

your paper deals with a highly underresearched topic in European natural hazards research. This is all the more astonishing as education is considered one of the most important activities to improve social capacities and thus contributes to better preparedness.

However, I think the current version requires some improvements: I particularly missed questions or hypotheses guiding your research questions and also recommend a clearer description of the methodology.

C473

In more detail please consider the following changes:

0 Abstract: Add research questions and give an outlook on some of your results.

1 Introduction: Again, add research questions (or hypotheses) in this chapter or in a separate one. What were the objectives of your research and of this paper, respectively? - p. 1, 24-5: you speak about “absence of risk education” in Europe – this is a very global statement which in this absoluteness is not true (and you yourselves give some examples for risk education activities in Europe) - p. 2, 21-2: the statement, that education must take key world problems into account with regard to natural hazards, is not explained/justified

2 Analysis: I suggest separating the methodology and the results sections into extra chapters. - p. 3, 10-3: no source is provided for this statement - p. 3, 17-26: no source is provided for the information given - p. 3, 30: change “methodical” into “methodological” - p. 5, 4: why is your first reference to Fig. 4? Maybe rearrange the order of the figures. - p. 6, 6-7: I don’t understand why from the nature of school geography as both a physical and a social science follows that it is more “analytical”. And another question arises: more than what? - p. 6, 14-29: please find another form of the presentation of the country names and textbook pages. - p. 7, 6-14: could go into a footnote - p. 7, 24-27: why do the numbers provided differ from those given in Table 4? - p. 7, 29: I doubt that agriculture is still playing an important role in the European economy (rather soil is an important prerequisite for agriculture). - p. 8, 19: explain why the “actual share of pages could be even higher”. - p. 8, 28-32: can you provide reasons or considerations for/on these findings?

3 Conclusions: Between analysis and conclusions, a discussion section is needed (given, that research questions or hypotheses are provided). However, the current conclusions section contains some discussion elements. So it's probably possible to rearrange the text and add some more reflexions once you've also explained your research questions/aims.

C474

4 Acknowledgements: Please add the contract number of the CapHaz-Net project.

5 References: Two of the German references are misspelled (check: Schmidt Wulfen, Schmithülsen).

Good luck with your revision!

best Annett

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 1, 2255, 2013.