

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., author comment AC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-177-AC1>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



Reply on RC1

Giuliano Di Baldassarre et al.

Author comment on "Multiple hazards and risk perceptions over time: the availability heuristic in Italy and Sweden under COVID-19" by Giuliano Di Baldassarre et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-177-AC1>, 2021

We would like to thank Anonymous Referee #1 for reviewing our manuscript, being positive about the paper, and providing highly constructive comments. These will help us improve the description of this research work. We intend to carefully address all of them in the revised manuscript, as highlighted below.

RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC COMMENTS

(a) We thank the Referee for finding our analysis “interesting and of high quality”. We totally agree that these data can potentially be examined in more detail. We will definitely enrich the revised manuscript by comparing more explicitly the role of experience in shaping public perceptions (availability heuristic) with the one of gender, age and political orientation. Yet, some types of detailed analyses are not feasible while considering all hazards. Simple methods are preferred here in order to compare multiple hazards of different nature. More complex models or regression analyses will be used for future studies focusing on specific hazards. See also point (b). The revised manuscript will discuss this point and provide a sound justification of the research methods.

(b) Indeed, spatially distributed data can be used to examine differences between actual impacts and risk perceptions. Yet, location of respondents is not exact. The survey only provides information about the administrative region (e.g. Tuscany) in which each respondent is located. This prevents us to determine whether they “live close to high-risk areas” for some hazards. In other words, this can be done for hazards operating at larger scale (e.g. droughts), but not for the more localized ones (e.g. floods). Future studies will definitely explore the spatial aspect (also linking to disaster risk reduction policies), but focusing for a sub-set of hazards.

(c) We welcome the Referee’s suggestion to discuss the findings about climate change. We will add one paragraph in the revised manuscript to examine the potential overlap between climate change and weather extremes and how they can potentially influence our conclusions.

(d) The Referee is right. The paper would be enriched by discussing the role of consecutive and multiple risks. We will add one paragraph in the revised manuscript addressing this point and referring to the most recent literature in the topic.

Lastly, we thank the Referee for providing "technical corrections". Very useful. We will amend them all in the revised manuscript.