

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 May 2019

This paper is relevant and addresses an area where there is a gap of knowledge, in the Mediterranean and other places in the world, especially where tsunamis are infrequent, but could also be of high impact. I feel this paper provides the state of awareness of tsunamis in the region under consideration that would be helpful for implementing disaster risk reduction strategies.

The questions used in the survey should be included as a supplement.

The section on Research Hypothesis with the two Research Hypothesis needs to be rewritten and stated more clearly. There is a reference to Mitigation measures, but the paper does not address the state of mitigation (preparedness) efforts in the region.

In the interpretation of the findings, there is no reference to preparedness and edu-

C1

cation outreach activities that have been carried out and may lead to a different risk perception, in addition to the presence of the volcanoes.

Need to fix numbering of the Figures and verify reference to them in the text.

The map of with distribution of interviewees, needs to have clearly labeled the places referred to in the text. It would also be helpful to see on this or another map, areas that have been the source of have been impacted by previous events and are referred to in the text.

I was very confused by what was lumped together under "other broadcast media" in figure 2 and Table 3 (which the first column is not added up correctly) - it does not match the narrative. Did the question on INTERNET, also include Social Media specifically? For many Internet (web site) is very different from social media. I am surprised to not see a Social Media category.

In 5.2 and Figure 3 it is not clear to me the interpretation of neutral? In the text it says for this category respondent "had no idea about its probability", is this really the case, it seems to be that the intermediate between Quite Likely and Unlikely would be "likely" or does neutral mean "i dont know". This is important because it affects the conclusion with regards to the state of perception.

The Conclusion section needs to be rewritten and be more substantial with a focus on the findings from the survey. The authors go off on tangents, that are not related or a product of the surveys.

One of the areas for further development would seem to be to integrate the perception of the tourists, which account for a greater number than residents.

It refers to focus groups as non standard, it was my impression (I am not a social scientist) that these were valid. Many of the social science studies our agency supports use focus groups. What is meant by "collection of biographies".

The English language is not of good quality in many sections, especially the Abstract,

C2

Introduction and conclusion.

The second part of the title is not clear/compelling. It uses the term "sample suvey" - a survey is always a sample....

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