

## ***Interactive comment on “Comment on “Rip current related drowning deaths and rescues in Australia 2004–2011” by Brighton et al. (2013)” by B. C. Brewster and R. Gould***

**Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 10 July 2014

The authors indicated that the data provided by the United States of Lifesaving Association is misinterpreted. One reason is that the classification of "location" is not treated in the same way as that for the Australian data. As the result, surf and non-surf beaches are all included in calculating the drowning rate. Secondly, the Australian rescue data excluded the data which ignore rescue cause and thus reduced the sample size; for the US data, however, all report rescues are counted in the original paper. Thus the authors corrected the numbers and obtained, 81%, as the drowning rate attributed to rip currents in the US.

The reviewer considers rip related rescues may differ for different area. But, the rate of

C1396

rip related drowning deaths should vary in the same range, if no extra local threat exists.

The reviewer agrees with the other referee (Wooler) that there is a need of unified format of recording and reporting surf data and beach incidents. In the original paper, it would be objective if the raw data are tabulated in tables, then the readers can examine it. The reviewer noted that the highest rate of rip drowning deaths is of the strongest age group from Figure 4. This implies that rip threat awareness education needs more promotion.

In the Comment paper, there is one correction: On line 6, the authors refers to a number ' 57.9% ' should be ' 53.7% '.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 2761, 2014.