

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC2  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-37-RC2>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Comment on nhess-2021-37

Anonymous Referee #2

---

Referee comment on "Risk perception of local stakeholders on natural hazards:  
implications for theory and practice" by Mihai Ciprian Mărgărint et al., Nat. Hazards Earth  
Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-37-RC2>, 2021

---

Dear authors, I have read and appreciated your interesting work. The paper provides a comprehensive and extensive analysis of the risk perception of local stakeholders on natural hazards. The study involved the local stakeholders of Iași Metropolitan area for their decisional and operative role in emergencies.

The paper is well written, and well structured.

My general comments:

The initial assumptions, expressed with the three research questions, are very important and have probably guided your research. Their explanation is too concise and unclear. If it is true that they are part of the method, since they guided you in designing the interviews, they were the starting point of your research. I suggest you to give them more emphasis also in the introduction.

You have analyzed a broad spectrum of natural hazards of different nature, frequency and severity requiring very different prevention and preparedness measures in terms of costs and operational system. The effort made is considerable but the great differences between the analyzed risks and the stakeholder institutional roles could hide a little pitfall when you compare the survey results. This matter could be more stressed in the discussion.

The method and the statistical analyses can benefit from some minor adjustments, a work flow diagram may help to better clarify the method.

In the results section you should expand the description of the Correspondence Analysis biplots figures (Figs: 5, 9 and 10) that, in my opinion, is too short and concise reducing the potential interest of the analysis.

In general, to increase the readability of the paper, it could be helpful to add in the text the references of the questions (Q1, Q2, etc.) when you report the percentage values of the survey results. In the supplementary material Table A2 and Table A3 have some questions that are not in Table A1.

These comments and others minor were annotated and trace in the enclosed pdf file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2021-37/nhess-2021-37-RC2-supplement.pdf>