

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-192-RC2>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## Comment on nhess-2021-192

Anonymous Referee #2

---

Referee comment on "Evaluating the suitability of documents on the prevention of major risks intended for the general public" by Laetitia Ferrer and Corinne Curt, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-192-RC2>, 2021

---

The manuscript covers the very important issue of risk communication for the general public and specifically, how official documents (DICRIM) developed with the aim of contributing to awareness and knowledge of risks, can be easily understood. The authors analyzed the content of the French DICRIM and defined an indicator-based procedure and a decision support model used to analyze and improve the suitability of the official documents. It represents the second phase of a broader research, previously begun, which aims to build a decision support model in charge of drawing up and update documents regarding risk communication at municipal level.

Dear authors, I have carefully read your interesting manuscript and understood the underlying reasons and the important basic concepts. However, I encountered difficulties in reading the text, since it is not fluid, and in the understanding the workflow you used to perform your analysis. Some parts of the manuscript are, in my opinion, to be presented differently.

First of all, I did not understand how figure 3 can reflect the method used. If it is clear that a Systemic Analysis is performed for the suitability detection elements, but it is not clear to me how all the other sources used to select and identify other indicators were processed (the orange ellipses in figure 3). For example, the results of the questionnaire survey dedicated to the design of the cover page were used for the SI or for the CI indicator? I think you have used for the component analysis since the cover page is one of the document components but it is not clear when reading the manuscript. And it is the same for what you named "DICRIM database" or for the "opinions of residents".

A second problem concerns the experts: did they provide indicators or they were included in the verification phase only, or both?

I have also encountered a problem with some terminology, it is my fault, but it is not clear to me if anchoring points on the scales, references and milestones can be considered the same concept. Please clarify better the differences.

Regarding the scales of analysis, it is clear the reasons for using more than one. Conversely, I found difficulties in the understanding the way you have used the indicators for the two scale of analysis.

Finally, you analyzed three of the fifty DICRIM you collected and storage in a database. How your results can extend to all?

Please, you can find more specific comments in the pdf enclosed file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2021-192/nhess-2021-192-RC2-supplement.pdf>