

Interactive comment on “How awareness and confidence affect flood-risk precautionary behavior of Greek citizens: the role of perceptual and emotional mechanisms” by Katerina Papagiannaki et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 7 March 2019

The paper addresses a significant issue, in the general spectrum of flood risk perception and behavior. The authors examine hypotheses on whether risk perception and worry can mediate the effects of awareness raising and confidence-related factors. Overall, the paper is meaningful and provides novel results useful in the field. Scientific methods and assumptions are outlined clearly (although the manuscript would benefit from a few improvements in this sector).

Overall, the manuscript would benefit from making clear the boundaries between the introduction - problem presentation - literature review on one hand and approach-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



methodology-model used on the other.

In the way it is currently presented, parts of literature are included in the model specifications and hypotheses (chapter 2) which seems more as an important part of the methodology. In other words, the numerous citations and the literature findings mentioned in chapter 2 can go in the introduction chapter, and the rest of the model and variables description can be part of the methodology. I also suggest to the authors, although it is not necessary, to compile a figure that portrays the conceptual model of the study. Visualization would greatly benefit the manuscript. I believe it could facilitate the readers in appreciating the concept of the study more easily. The above steps would clarify significantly the steps followed.

Minor issues: page 1, lines 13-14: please reword to make more clear page 1, line 21: use "growing exposure of assets" instead of "growing exposure caused by increasing flood-prone assets" page 1, line 23: please rephrase "non-structural policies" as all policies are non-structural initiatives. For instance "non-structural measures and related policies" would be better. page 1, line 32: I suggest to remove the word negative page 2, line 13-14: The use of Bubeck et al 2012 references is not clear. If they suggest the same thing please state this in the phrase. page 2, line 13-14: in the same phrase, please clarify whose preparedness is examined. For some readers, it might be clear, but the meaning of the paragraph would benefit from a clarification here. page 2, line 16: I suggest using "websites in Greece" rather than "greek websites". page 3, line 14: I suggest using "people to enhance damage prevention efforts" rather than "people to prevent damage". page 3, chapter 2.3. Please add a phrase or two, explaining what mediators are and how mediators act with more clarity. page 4, line 16: I find the wording "we expect that there is a significant relationship" should be avoided. A wording such as "we investigate the type and significance of relationship" would be better. page 4, line 36: "in the face of flood threats" rather than "before a flood hazard". page 7, line 1: how much is the marginal positive effect? page 8, line 3-4: family status was also associated in the literature. I believe should be mentioned here to strengthen

this finding. (See: Thieken A.H. , H. Kreibich, M. Muller, B. Merz, Coping with floods: preparedness, response and recovery of flood-affected residents in Germany in 2002, *Hydrol. Sci. J.* 52 (2007) 1016–1037. Zaalberg R., C. Midden, A. Meijnders, T. McCalley, Prevention, adaptation, and threat denial: flooding experiences in the Netherlands, *Risk Anal.* 29 (2009) 1759–1778. Dooley D., R. Catalano, S. Mishra, S. Serxner, Earthquake preparedness: Predictors in a community survey, *J. Appl. Soc. Psych.* 22 (1992) 451–470. Papagiannaki et al. (2017) and Diakakis et al. (2018) for Greece findings agree with the family status results). Page 9, line 1: please clarify sentence, or provide a second phrase to clarify Page 9, line 7: please correct "at el" to "et al." Page 10, line 6: I suggest the use of "in this case, policy makers should reach" rather than "therefore, policy makers should clearly reach". The suggested phrase is a lighter claim that seems more appropriate.

Interactive comment on *Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-307>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

