

Interactive comment on “Tsunami risk perception in Southern Italy: first evidence from a sample survey” by Andrea Cerase et al.

Andrea Cerase et al.

andrea.cerase@gmail.com

Received and published: 22 July 2019

Authors' final response

Dear Editor,

we would like to thank you and the two reviewers for the very valuable suggestions. We attach below our point-to-point answers to Referees' comments. We do not send an updated version of the manuscript, but we are ready to revise the whole text whenever we will be asked to proceed.

Anonymous Referee 1 Received and published: 8 May 2019

- Anonymous Referee 1 The research presents a gap in the literature regarding the

C1

risk perception of citizens who did not recently experience a tsunami or those who think that an event like this will never occur in the Mediterranean ocean. I believe this is an interesting topic and it has scientific significance. Nevertheless, there are major issues in the manuscript that the authors must address to be suitable for publication.

State three objectives is a big risk. According to the results of the article, the authors only address the first objective. The authors must delimit the scope of the paper. The three goals probably can be turned into three different papers.

- Authors response We will duly take into account this suggestion. The first objective is comprehensive enough to set a discussion and objectives 2 and 3 will be briefly discussed as a corollary of objective 1.

- Authors' proposed changes (with line numbers) [Lines 106-111] This pilot study has the main strategic goal of providing empirical data on citizens' understanding and risk perception in a tsunami risk prone area, also allowing future comparisons with different areas of the NEAM Region. Moreover, the results will contribute to identify key messages, channels and techniques to effectively communicate tsunami risk in the Mediterranean area.

- Anonymous Referee 1 The hypotheses are not clear. The first RH1 must be redefined as a hypothesis and not as an affirmation. The RH2 is not relevant. Many studies already discover these differences.

- Authors response We will rewrite hypothesis 1 and 2. We better focused RH1. We accept referee's suggestion about RH2 to better focus the way tsunami risk is perceived in the different coastal areas, also considering the influence of the social demographic variables.

- Authors' proposed changes (with line numbers) [Lines 227-231] RH1: Does people's perception in Italy about tsunamis rely upon media representations of catastrophic events such as those occurred in Sumatra and Japan? RH 2: Are there differences

C2

in risk perception related to different coastal areas and/or hazard level?

- Anonymous Referee 1 The methods and techniques section is deficient. A description of the study area and sample characteristics are missing. Also, there is not a description of the questionnaire, and most importantly, there is no evidence regarding the questions, neither the papers that were used to select the questions.

- Authors response We agree. We will provide a wider and stringent description of the areas and of the reference universe, of sampling methods and sample characteristics, including response rate. We will also provide an in-depth account of the way questionnaire was built up, including a discussion of the literature we have used. The main reference is the Dominey-Bird and Howes papers, which are cited in the reference list, but we also opted to personalise the questions. The way questionnaire has been developed and tested will be also described in this section.

- Anonymous Referee 1 The authors perform a focus group to test the questionnaire? Which was the no response rate?

- Authors response We will better describe the way questionnaire was built. We organised and administered two focus groups with 1) scientists and 2) lay people. The first one involved INGV tsunami scientists for a first review and an elicitation of scientific content of the questions. The aim of this focus group was to ensure that questions would have properly translated physical measures inherent to tsunamis (such as Maximum Inundation Eight, ingression and so on) into questions comprehensible for lay people. Our goal was to address in the most precise way the gap between "(mediated) representation of tsunamis" and "physical reality of tsunamis". Secondly, the questionnaire was tested on a non – representative sample of about twenty people with socio - demographic characteristics closer to the sample, to assess questions' readability, understanding and possible bias in the way questions were formulated. More in detail, we submitted the questionnaire to people with low and medium level of education rather than graduates, then we asked them to provide feedback. Suggestions were used as

C3

a base to rephrase some questions as to make them easier to understand.

- Authors' proposed changes (with line numbers) [Line 235] we will add the previous two paragraphs in the paper.

- Anonymous Referee 1 There are many errors about the numbers of the figures and tables, and many of them were not used in the text, such as Figure1, Table 1 and Figure 6.

- Authors response We apologize for this. We will fix the problems.

- Anonymous Referee 1 The Discussion section must be stated as "Results and Discussion" because it is confusing to the reader a Discussion section with so many results in it.

- Authors response We agree. We will rename and re-arrange this section to make it more readable.

- Anonymous Referee 1 Finally, I really think that the paper has significant relevance for the area, but the authors must rewrite the manuscript and organize it according to the journal standards.

- Authors response We will thoroughly revise the manuscript according to the journal's guidelines. Æ

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2019-97/nhess-2019-97-AC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-97>, 2019.

C4