

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

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 8 May 2019

The research presents a gap in the literature regarding the 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.

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.

C1

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. The authors perform a focus group to test the questionnaire? Which was the no response rate?

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.

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. 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.

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

C2