

Interactive comment on “Public Perceptions of a Rip Current Hazard Education Program: ‘Break the Grip of the Rip!’” by Chris Houser et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 26 February 2017

The goal of the study was “to examine United States based beachgoers understanding of, and experience with the national Break the Grip of the Rip program and the rip current hazard in order to provide quantitative evidence to guide future improvements to beach safety education material”.

Probably I’m the right person to comment this article because I have not experience with the kind of hazard analysed in the paper. I understand that the aim of the Authors is to analyse the results of the survey and that the article is not focused on the phenomenon “per se”, nevertheless I think that they presume that all the readers know about it, while this is not true.

I.e., describing figure 2 they assume that all the readers know what are the most dangerous sectors, but it is not true instead (or it is not for me that only know Mediterranean

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Sea and swimming pools). Maybe some notes in the caption of figure 2 could avoid that a reader having no experience with this type of phenomenon does not understand its importance and only can appreciate the correct scientific analysis of data.

The same impression reading the section Forecast. The Authors should first give clear information on the “right message”, the right definition of high/low risk and then present the different people answers. In my opinion, this lack of information can generate confusion and obstruct a complete comprehension of the importance of the different answers.

Resuming, the paper can be improved taking in account two main problems that it presents:

1) The Authors, in my opinion, are too much focused on the results of their analysis and neglect to take into account that not all the readers know the analysed phenomenon.

2) The paper is very fluent but also very long and not schematic. I think that a further effort should be done to summarise the main results of each paragraph in a table for each paragraph, and also in a general table summarising all the findings in the discussion. Otherwise, as the paper is structured, the reader can not perceive each of the results obtained. Considering that this paper should be the starting point of an improvement of the Campaign, I think that the results should appear more clearly from the paper, in form of a list of bullets.

About figures:

Figure 2: The authors have the answer in mind but also the readers would like to know it.

Figure 3: some of the characters are impossible to read. I suggest reducing the description, reducing the size of the diagram, increasing the size of the characters and putting the labels vertically (print to understand if it is readable).

Figure 4: reduce the size of the diagram and increase the size of captions that currently

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



are impossible to read

Figure 5, 6 and 7: as for fig. 3

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-16, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

