

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., author comment AC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-365-AC2>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC2

Samuel Rufat et al.

Author comment on "Surveying the surveyors to address risk perception and adaptive-behaviour cross-study comparability" by Samuel Rufat et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-365-AC2>, 2022

We appreciate the positive evaluation of our paper and we thank you for your helpful suggestions for improving it. We have revised the Introduction (Section 1) to more clearly explain the objectives of the paper and the significance of comparability of studies in particular with respect to replication and meta-analyses. We have expanded the Methods (section 2) and Discussion (Section 8) to further discuss the potential bias towards flood risk perceptions. We take confidence however in R1's (Michael Lindell) comment on this particular point: *"In the absence of a census of researchers and hazards in the field of risk perception and adaptive behavior, it is unknown whether these sample characteristics are representative of the field's researchers. Nonetheless, the authors have identified and summarized problems that I have seen repeatedly during my 50 years studying floods, volcanic eruptions, hazardous materials releases, earthquakes, hurricanes, tornadoes, and tsunamis in the US and other Pacific Basin countries. Consequently, their data are likely to generalize to other hazards and countries."* We have also followed Michael Lindell's comprehensive suggestions to help include a broader risk perception literature throughout the manuscript and in particular in the Discussion (Section 8) to ensure this is more representative across the whole field of risk perception. For Figure 6 (Section 4), we have clarified that it is based on a multiple choice question. Even though some categories may appear to overlap, we have clarified the difference between 'from the literature' and 'from other studies', as for 'colleagues in my field' and 'people in different countries' they were designed to capture different behaviour. As for the impact of COVID-19 on perception research, this was an open and optional question in the survey. As reported in Section 7, some colleagues did detail a change in their approach, methods or study designs – mostly online interviews and online surveys – fewer, however, than those who reported having to postpone their studies. We do not feel their small numbers allow for a more detailed estimation or quantification of the impact of the pandemic on perception research. Based on your other comments, we have made other *ad hoc* clarifications in Section 2 (interdisciplinary), Section 5 (socio-demographic characteristics), Figure 8 (formatting) and Section 8 (share of studies). Thank you again for your detailed and useful comments which helped improving the paper.