



Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Perception of flood and landslide risk in Italy: a preliminary analysis” by P. Salvati et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 27 May 2014

Landslide risk perception has been the poor relation in hazard perception studies. It is high time that were rectified. Hence I applaud this paper and hope that it can be published quickly. The survey was very well done and the results are interesting. The authors have handled with aplomb the difficult task of comparing perceptions with complex spatial, gender and age differences with objective realities. I suggest publication with a few minor amendments. The most demanding of these would be to restructure the literature review in order to make it more relevant to the bulk of the paper.

Specific points:-

Lines 63-149: The literature review is very competent and polished, but it is somewhat unnecessary. It would be better to summarise the small literature on landslide

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



perception and place it in the context of these wider developments in risk perception. Personally, I found this section to be an interesting, useful and entirely accurate summary of risk perception, but one that is hard to connect specifically to landslides.

Lines 221-231: much of Puglia is flat and most of Val d'Aosta is mountainous.

Line 277: do you mean 'floods' when you write 'inundations'? The term is something of a "false friend" with inondazioni, as it could refer simply to torrential rainfall.

Line 300: recursively = repeated

Line 349: sp: may

Line 378: It is controversial to say that climate change is "largely natural"

I am not quite sure what one is supposed to conclude from surveys conducted in two consecutive years. Presumably, the one acts as a sensitivity control on the other, as they could hardly illustrate a trend. Perhaps this point could be made more clearly, with an explanation of why there were two survey campaigns.

Line 474: sp: flood

Conclusions: Why not re-evaluate the literature review in the light of the findings of this study?

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 3465, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

