

## ***Interactive comment on “Public Perceptions of a Rip Current Hazard Education Program: ‘Break the Grip of the Rip!’” by Chris Houser et al.***

**Chris Houser et al.**

chouser@uwindsor.ca

Received and published: 4 April 2017

I understand that the aim of the Authors is to analyze the results of the survey and that the article is not focused on the phenomenon “per se”, nevertheless I think that they presume that all the readers know about it, while this is not true. For example, describing figure 2 they assume that all the readers know what are the most dangerous sectors, but it is not true instead (or it is not for me that only know Mediterranean Sea and swimming pools). Maybe some notes in the caption of figure 2 could avoid that a reader having no experience with this type of phenomenon does not understand its importance and only can appreciate the correct scientific analysis of data.

â€” We agree with the reviewer that this level of detail is a needed revision to the manuscript. We will add notations to Figure 2 to identify the safe and unsafe areas in

C1

each picture, including the location of the rip current in each photograph. An additional annotation will be added to the Figure heading to let readers know that the annotation was not included in the original survey.

The same impression reading the section Forecast. The Authors should first give clear information on the “right message”, the right definition of high/low risk and then present the different people answers. In my opinion, this lack of information can generate confusion and obstruct a complete comprehension of the importance of the different answers.

â€” The question raised by the reviewer represents one of the problems with the current warning systems for rips - there is no ‘right message’ for the definition of high or low risk. The forecast used by different agencies and in different areas are not consistent (as discussed on page 6, line 141), which means that it is not possible to identify the ‘right message’ for readers. However, we will add a statement to the methodology and results section on forecasts to remind the reader that there is no ‘right message’ and that we are only concerned about whether the respondent believed the message to be consistent with their observations.

The Authors, in my opinion, are too much focused on the results of their analysis and neglect to consider that not all the readers know the analyzed phenomenon.

â€” We will add a section in the introduction that describes rips in more detail and explain their formation. This will be combined with the suggestion by Reviewer #2 to describe how rip forcing and behavior may vary in different regions.

The paper is very fluent, but also very long and not schematic. I think that a further effort should be done to summarize the main results of each paragraph in a table for each paragraph, and also in a general table summarizing all the findings in the discussion. Otherwise, as the paper is structured, the reader can not perceive each of the results obtained. Considering that this paper should be the starting point of an improvement of the Campaign, I think that the results should appear more clearly from

C2

the paper, in form of a list of bullets.

â€” This is a very interesting suggestion that will help to summarize the main findings from each section. We will add this table to the beginning of the discussion section. In response to Reviewer #2 we will also be modifying the conclusion section to include bulleted outcomes of the study.

Figure 2: The authors have the answer in mind but also the readers would like to know it.

â€” As noted above, we will add notations to Figure 2 to show the location of safe and unsafe swimming areas, as well as the location of the rip current in each photograph.

Figure 3: some of the characters are impossible to read. I suggest reducing the description, reducing the size of the diagram, increasing the size of the characters and putting the labels vertically (print to understand if it is readable).

â€” We will increase the size of the text in the revised manuscript to ensure that all characters are readable.

Figure 4: reduce the size of the diagram and increase the size of captions that currently are impossible to read

â€” We will increase the size of the text in the revised manuscript to ensure that all characters are readable.

Figure 5, 6 and 7: as for fig. 3

â€” We will increase the size of the text in the revised manuscript to ensure that all characters are readable.

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2017-16, 2017.