

Dear authors, dear editor,

the study addresses a relevant topic that received relatively little attention in the literature. It mainly aims at examining the effect of a one-way risk communication strategy on flood risk awareness and preparedness of property owners in Zurich. To answer this question, a cross-sectional research design is used with a good sample size.

Major comments:

- The authors conclude from their analysis that the information campaign had a statistically significant effect on the level of preparedness and awareness. I doubt that this conclusion can be drawn from the analysis provided. To really demonstrate the effect of the information campaign, I would have expected a comparison with a control group (that did not receive the information material) or a comparison of results before and after the distribution of the information material. Otherwise, it cannot be established whether e.g. personal characteristics explain the effect. On page 180, line 23, the authors explicitly mention “that risk awareness is partly rooted in personal attitudes towards risk.” I would assume the same effect for preparedness. The authors also report that risk aversion significantly correlated with their willingness to implement measures. How can the authors distinguish between the influence of such personal characteristics and the effect of the campaign?
- In my view, section 2 could be better structured. It seems to discuss two topics: on the one hand factors that influence flood preparedness. On the other, studies on risk communications and their effects. I feel that both topics could be more clearly distinguished. For instance, on page 170 /171, factors of influence on preparedness are discussed. Then risk communication is addressed on page 172. On page 173 (line 17), again factors influencing risk preparedness are discussed.

Also, the relation between risk perceptions and protective behavior is first addressed on page 170 (23ff) and then again on page 174 (6ff).

- Sometimes, I feel that Section 2 could be better linked to the empirical analysis. For instance, it is mentioned that emotions play an important role (page 171, line 5 and 173, line 1) in terms of preparedness and risk communications. Later on, the role of emotions is hardly addressed.
- Could the authors please explain their reasons for applying a PCI? Wouldn't it be more interesting to look at the respective variables individually? For instance, to be able to distinguish between worry and risk perceptions instead of using the scale item 'Risk Awareness'?
- On page 187 (8), the authors state that interpretation of causal (not casual) directions is difficult. In the same sentence they write that these correlations confirm... This is contradictory, in my view. Are these results really confirmed?

Minor comments:

- On page 182 it says that knowledge before the campaign was lower than after the campaign. Does this mean that there are data from before and after the campaign that could be used for comparison and to see whether there are statistically significant differences? This is not clear to me.
- 4.1 is entitled 'Little concern....' while this section addresses risk awareness. As you also discuss emotions (worry / concern), please be careful with the wording.
- A map of the case study including the hazard zones would make the article better accessible.
- On page 169, line 7, it reads that risk maps could be made available. Isn't this obligatory according to the Floods Directive?
- On page 170ff, the authors discuss the relation between risk perceptions and hazard preparedness. There have been several articles addressing this issue recently that could be included in the article (Siegrist 2013; Wachinger et al., 2013; Bubeck et al., 2013; Birkholz et

- al., 2014).
- Sentence on page 169, line 10 seems incorrect: “Risk management has moved....”
 - Page 170, line 22: “If investigated, it appeared...” What is meant by ‘it’?
 - On page 188: please explain why this finding explains rather contradictory findings from other studies?

Literature:

Siegrist, M. (2013). The necessity for longitudinal studies in risk perception research. *Risk Analysis*, 33(1), 50-51.

Bubeck, P., Botzen, W. J. W., Kreibich, H., & Aerts, J. C. J. H. (2013). Detailed insights into the influence of flood-coping appraisals on mitigation behaviour. *Global Environmental Change*, 23(5), 1327-1338.

Wachinger, G., Renn, O., Begg, C., & Kuhlicke, C. (2013). The risk perception paradox—Implications for governance and communication of natural hazards. *Risk Analysis*, 33(6), 1049-1065.

Birkholz, S., Muro, M., Jeffrey, P., & Smith, H. M. (2014). Rethinking the relationship between flood risk perception and flood management. *Science of The Total Environment*, 478, 12-20.