

## ***Interactive comment on “Responses to severe weather warnings and affective decision-making” by Philippe Weyrich et al.***

**Philippe Weyrich et al.**

[philippe.weyrich@usys.ethz.ch](mailto:philippe.weyrich@usys.ethz.ch)

Received and published: 14 August 2020

- We thank the Reviewer very much for the comment. The weather company with which we partnered for this study, developed 31 different behavioural recommendations for the three severity levels. Depending of the geographical situation, the time of the year and other factors, the forecaster decides ad-hoc which behavioural recommendations to include in the message. Thus, we include a Table with a selection of only some of the recommendations.

“In Table 1 we list the general behavioural recommendations that were provided in both standard and impact-based warnings.”

- The Reviewer pointed out correctly that most European Meteorological Services is-

C1

sue standard warnings that do not include behavioural recommendations. However, we decided to keep the term SW as these are the standard warnings of our “weather partner” and are still close to the average standard warning in Europe. In the end, we believe that it is just a definition and with the additional Table, it should be clear what we understand under SW. However, we acknowledge the Reviewer’s comment in a sentence. “It’s important to note that most European Meteorological Services do not include generic behavioural recommendations in their standard warning \*.” \* Kaltenberger, R., Schaffhauser, A., and Staudinger, M.: “What the weather will do” – results of a survey on impact-oriented and impact-based warnings in European NMHSs, *Adv. Sci. Res.*, 17, 29–38, <https://doi.org/10.5194/asr-17-29-2020, 2020>.

- We thank the Reviewer for his comments regarding the discussion of the results. We included these in the conclusion section of the paper. “Also, we should be cautious in generalizing the results as these are somehow contextually dependent. The provision of rather little additional information in the warning message might be another reason that in the field experiment IBW did not result in greater behavioural response compared to SW. It could be that SWs without behavioural recommendations, and IBWs with stronger language and richer impact descriptions could have resulted in different findings.”

- In the final paragraph, we highlight some of the limitations of the study. We explain that the lack of very severe hazards may have influenced our results, as well as the fact that we only investigated the hazard wind. Based on the Reviewer’s feedback, we also mentioned the relatively short study period that was in winter (and results may differ in summer). “Thus, additional research could analyse whether these results are also valid for other natural hazards, as well as for different time periods in the year.

**Table 1.** Behavioural recommendations per severity level in the warning messages. Note that this list is not exclusive.

Warning severity level		
<i>Moderate (level 1)</i>	<i>Severe (level 2)</i>	<i>Very severe (level 3)</i>
Don't make fire	Avoid wind-exposed areas	Be aware of falling objects
Close windows	Secure loose items	Follow instructions of emergency services
Drive slowly	Avoid forests	Seek protection in buildings

**Fig. 1.** Table 1

C3