



EGUsphere, referee comment RC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-927-RC1>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## **Comment on egusphere-2022-927**

Anonymous Referee #1

---

Referee comment on "Understanding representations of uncertainty, an eye-tracking study – Part 1: The effect of anchoring" by Kelsey J. Mulder et al., EGU sphere, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-927-RC1>, 2022

---

This is an important issue - not just for users, but for professionals formulating warning messages. Anchoring can be positive, e.g. if the anchor line is set at an agreed response threshold e.g. reasonable worst case, or for a specific cost/loss ratio, but it can also be negative especially in a low probability high impact situation, if highlighting of the median leads to underestimation of risk.

Line 84: It should be noted that the sample is not representative of typical users. I don't believe this undermines their results in any way, but a comment on the differences between the sample and typical real life users might be worth including.

Line 105-6: The meaning of the three probability levels is not clear. I believe it may mean that there were three forecast scenarios presented with data adjusted to give 30%, 50% and 70% probabilities of exceeding 1 metre, and that each was presented in 7 different ways. However, I am still not sure if that is a correct interpretation. There is no figure that shows what the three scenarios look like (maybe the deterministic presentations would clearly display them?). I think it would also be helpful to include a brief description of how the 3 scenarios were created.

Line 131: The authors should not assume that all readers will be familiar with the fit statistics for the ANOVA or Bonferroni tests. I suggest adding a short section 2.3 to introduce the statistical tests used and the meaning of the fit statistics (supplemented by a suitable reference) .

Line 179: The explanation of the reason that good interpretations were made of the spaghetti plots despite even less attention to the key than for the boxplots may be correct, but it runs counter to the general view that spaghetti plots should be avoided because they are difficult to interpret (due to crossing lines etc). I think this view should

be acknowledged and responded to.

Line 189: This paragraph does not tell us what the impact on answer time actually is, merely what the statistics are of the differences. We should not have to look at the figure to work this out.

Line 198: a comment on the increase in time to estimate the maximum in a spaghetti plot with median is needed.

Line 211: This line starts with "However", which seems out of place given that the previous paragraph was also talking about the dangers of anchoring.