

***Interactive comment on* “Culture matters: Factors influencing natural hazard risk preparedness – a survey of Swiss households” by E. Maidl et al.**

Michael Nones (Referee)

mnonnes@igf.edu.pl

Received and published: 11 September 2019

The article presents the results of a nation-wide survey on factors influencing natural hazard risk preparedness, using Switzerland as a case study. The outcomes are interesting, but many drawbacks are affecting the manuscript and prevent its publication, as pointed out in the following.

One of the key points that reduces the validity of this manuscript is reported at the end of the manuscript (Section 5.3): the outcomes are statistically not significant, and there is more than a bias in the answers. Looking at the numbers, are you sure that around 20% of response rate (with only 15% in risk zones) and maximum R2 in the order of 0.25 could be considered as statistically significant? Moving from that, one

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



can conclude that all the results reported and their discussion are more a personal interpretation of the authors rather than scientific evidence. In addition, as also the authors highlighted, a single survey is not enough for drawing some conclusions on the general behaviour of a country. I suggest spending more effort in justifying what is the goal of your research, and why a reader should treat your outcomes as reliable and representative.

The manuscript is too vague, combining a multitude of concepts that are not well related and seem out of the context. In fact, in several points, the concept is described only under a general point of view, without adding any detail that can be helpful in better understanding the authors' view and the contribution that they want to provide in understanding such a concept. In this sense, a paper should not be a summary of the authors' knowledge, but rather a logical and consecutive description of specific research.

The rationale of the study and the theoretical description of the research (Section 2) should be rewritten, pointing out only the missing gaps addressed in this study, without mixing them with general theories. In addition, the use of very short subsections reduces the readability of the manuscript. Given that such sections are somehow interconnected, I suggest rearranging them for having a more coherent structure.

There is the need to be more specific and quantitatively address the topic. As an example, in asking about "suffered material damage" or "experience of personal threat" did you provide any indication? Each person can have a different reaction and consider threat or damage in different ways. How did you account for such inconsistencies among the citizens involved in the study?

The Discussion is just a continuation of the Results section, while it should propose new arguments that support (or not) the proposed approach. The conclusions that you reported are frequently not supported by the results (or a clear understanding of the connection between them is hindered behind complicated sentences).

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

In reporting numbers, it is not clear the units that you use. I think that, in most cases, you are speaking about percent, but, please, re-read carefully the text and provide all the details.

Before resubmitting, please double-check all the sentences, because, in this version, there are many phrases which are incomplete or not well connected with the successive ones.

The language style and grammar should be checked by a native English speaker.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-393>, 2019.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

