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Referee comment on "Tsunami risk perception in Central and Southern Italy" by Lorenzo Cugliari et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-212-RC2, 2022

General comment:

The manuscript aims in adding new data to an earlier work based on a tsunami perception survey. This paper utilizes the result of a lot more responses, in order to understand the level of perception and knowledge about the tsunami risk in the areas of central and southern Italy.

The technical approach and the methodology applied are based on approved interviewing procedures, which are validated through statistical tests. The overall presentation is well structured, clear and easy to understand by a wide and general audience, while the content is concise and the English language is of good quality, fluent, simple and easy to read and understand by a wide and diversified audience. The authors also give proper credit to previous and related work.

Specific comments:

- How far inland you assume a coastal belt? This could also give an idea of the population density. In the Rome case, the importance of this distance looks important.
- Have you considered interviewing people inland to know their perspective, but also since they could be, most probably, possible coastal visitors?
- A clear distinction of hazard and risk should be made. I think in lines 113-114 there is some confusion.
- How did you unsure and homogenize the results of three different surveys in time and the national survey as well, which I understood that is was a separate survey form CATI, only to the very end (lines 706-708), where it makes clear that the national survey is not included in the CATI sample. The use of the national sample is not clear enough (section 4.1.3).
- Socio-demographic criteria were also applied to all the surveys or only to the national survey. Please clarify somewhere in the text. I understood that age was applied, but I am not sure about education level for example.
- In the paper Q16 is extensively discussed. The reasons for the outcomes of this question were only speculated and assumed (for example: “The percentage of tsunami risk perception in Catania, is probably associated with the presence of easily recognized hazards” or “The high tsunami risk perception is likely related to the 1908 tsunami”). Were there any other questions included in the survey, which could help identifying the levels of risk perception that were reported based on Q16?
- “the tsunami hazard (Basili et al., 2021)” is mentioned for every region analyzed in section 4.1.2, but in a very brief (one sentence) way. A few more words would be very useful to link the risk to the hazard.

**Technical corrections:**

Please refer to the uploaded annotated pdf document for line by line comments.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: [https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2022-212/nhess-2022-212-RC2-supplement.pdf](https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2022-212/nhess-2022-212-RC2-supplement.pdf)