Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

EGU

Discussions

NHESSD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "How awareness and confidence affect flood-risk precautionary behavior of Greek citizens: the role of perceptual and emotional mechanisms" *by* Katerina Papagiannaki et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 December 2018

The topic of the paper "HOW AWARENESS AND CONFIDENCE AFFECT FLOOD-RISK PRECAUTIONARY BEHAVIOUR OF GREEK CITIZENS: THE ROLE OF PERCEPTUAL AND EMOTIONAL MECHANISMS" is interesting but in the current form the article is not very attractive. I suggest to the Authors a shorter, clear and direct way to organise the article, especially because the topic is slightly outside of the expertise of usual readers of NHESS. I suggest focusing on the following points: 1. There is no clear border between the literature and the work done for the paper. The Authors should quote the previous studies mainly into literature review. Currently it

[Printer-friendly version]

[Discussion paper]

is very difficult to understand and distinguish the literature from the Authors opinions and elaborations. 2. It is not to expect that the reader goes through the quoted literature: the article must supply the basic information to follow the discussion 3. The paper needs to be rearranged in a more scientific way, introducing definitions of all the variables and clarifying the meaning of each variable in this specific article. This should be applied for example to page 2, line 35-40. Authors should talk of the two entities separately, not using a prosaic comparison and writing their name more than once (Current preparedness= xxx. Preparedness intention= yyy). 4. Structure and graphic design of tables and figures currently are scarce and this affect the global quality of the paper 5. Introduction needs a concise and direct description of paper objectives, because currently is difficult to comprehend. 6. The abstract is not very explicative and in the current form, it is not easy to understand if the results obtained are consistent or not. 7. Sections 2.2 and 2.3. If Authors eliminate the repetitions and go straight to the sense of the variables, the reader can understand the meaning. The Authors should make an effort to find a clear DEFINITION of each of the variables, moving the exaggerate number of reference in a specific column 8. Authors should describe variables and model separately. Currently, the model has no name and I did not found a paragraph describing it in an exhausting way. 9. The core of the paper is the appendix 1, that the Authors. It is not homogeneous, contains formulas "described", questions, a lot of inverted commas and references, without reporting the meaning of the different values that the variables can assume. How the reader can understand the results if these elements are missing? For page 3 and for the appendix, I suggest a clear and definite table. It must be clear when the Authors: a) used a definition existing in literature, b) when they modified it and (above all) c) what is the definition, possibly using a scheme repeating for each variable

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2018-307/nhess-2018-307-RC1-supplement.pdf

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-307, 2018.