

Interactive comment on “Perceptions, impacts and adaptation of tropical cyclones in the Southwest Pacific: an urban perspective from Fiji, Vanuatu and Tonga” by A. D. Magee et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 December 2015

Referee comment: This article presents local perceptions, impacts and adaptation strategies of tropical cyclones in SWP region. The investigation of risk perception of people in remote regions in the world is an on-going topic and it is important for addressing specific risk reduction policies. For these reasons, the presented work is of interest to NHESS. However, it needs a major revision for several reasons:

- 1) The abstract part needs to be rearranged and integrate all results presented (risk perception results are not mentioned).
- 2) The introduction part should be better focused in explaining the results (i.e. on the value of knowing risk perception, TK with NTK strategies for disaster mitigation, early

C2842

source of information, education). Moreover it lacks to describe indigenous people that live in the region and some socio cultural descriptors of the population. Moreover I suggest putting some data about past TC events prior this work.

3) There is a general lack of quantitative data about respondents' perceptions and adaptation strategies. Some percentages could be useful to enrich the study. In addition demographic characteristics are not related to the results of the present study. It would be interest to explore if male or female, young or adult have higher/different perceived risk of TC activity and preparedness strategies. This information may be useful for practitioners and government to target specific management actions.

4) In the methodological part there are some weak points:

- Missing details about the types of questions (close ended, multiple choice, open etc..)
- It is not clear if the interview was addressed only to people speaking in English or wheatear if the authors translated the answers. Which are the languages spoken in the FVT region? Maybe some clarifications are needed in the methodological part. For sure language problems/deficiencies could affect the results of the “word cloud” presented in chapter 3.2.
- The authors took the first 40 more frequent words in the answers of people. Respondents were supposed to express a fixed number of words they had in mind in relation with TC events or they were supposed to talk freely? Please add these information.
- Tonga: The words in the word cloud figure do not match the text. In detail the author state that “personal safety, including fatalities, shock and disruption” were the most common concepts expressed by respondents. However the cloud seems to do not confirm the figure provided. Please explain.

5) Chapter 3.2. About religion nothing is mentioned in the text, whereas is showed in figure 2. Provide a sentence explaining what this word mean in relation of a TC event.

6) Chapter 3.4.1. What about TV that is the second most popular source of informa-

C2843

tion? It is common for residents in FTV to have access to a TV?

7) Chapter 4.2, line 10-12 Awareness between participants should be not mention in the previous chapter (4.1)? According to the title I would expect a discussion about preparation and adaptation strategies for DRR

8) One of the objectives of this work was to provide knowledge of TK activities in FTV region. However, in the results part, this argument is not explored so much (if not at all). It is therefore difficult to understand the reasons of exploring it in the discussion part. Moreover, the aim of the study is to explore urban people affected by TC without considering rural individuals, those that mostly use TK (page 7151 line 9). However, according to lines 13-15 (page 7151) it seems that TK activities are widely used even in the survey "urban population". For dealing this argument apart in the discussion part, there is a need of more results of the studied population and to better introduce the argument in the introduction section.

10) Tables and figures:

Table 1, I suggest change the table as follows:

Column field 1 - Question number

Column field 2- Section area (Demographic factors, Risk perception, Adaptation strategies.. etc)

Column field 3 - Questions related to each section area

Column 4 - Type of question (multiple choice, close ended, open questions)

Table 3 TK and NTK in accordance to weather related disasters or is a general classification? Please mention if appropriate

Figure 8 I suggest rearranging Figure 8 since it is not so clear. The caption express the preparation actions ("after", I guess are "before") a TC event. The title "TC warning" is not in line with the rest. It seems there are two different preparedness actions: property

C2844

protection actions and personal preventive practices (the latter include listen to TC warnings, helping the others and find for a shelter). This figure could be transformed as a table or change its layout if the authors want to keep it as a figure.

A lot of sentences need to be rephrased, since are difficult to understand or they are too long and complex My other comments are made through the file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/C2842/2015/nhessd-3-C2842-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 7135, 2015.