

Interactive comment on “Difficulties in explaining complex issues with maps. Evaluating seismic hazard communication — the Swiss case” by Michèle Marti et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 July 2019

I would like to thank the authors for their careful reply to my comments. I have to admit that I misunderstood the research question. In my view it is much more important to ask the question, if the hazard maps fulfill their role within an goal oriented risk communication (in this direction was my first major critique of the paper, although this is not the research question of the authors). Having in mind the critique of referee #2 the research question of the authors is, if the public can understand unnecessary complex information which they don't need for their preparedness actions – sorry, this formulation is a bit sarcastic, nevertheless I would like to insist a bit on my point: Especially in the conclusion section the authors could use all the empirical and expert knowledge, they have presented in the paper combined with their research results to

C1

give recommendations which really help to improve the quality of the presented maps within a goal oriented risk communication to the public. Here the authors should consider which types of maps are used by agencies of the natural hazard management in Switzerland to inform the public about natural hazards. The most common map is the danger zone plan (Gefahrenzonenplan) which includes a risk assessment of the magnitude and frequency of different scenarios. For a good risk communication a similar risk assessment should be developed by state actor (Swiss Seismological Service, PLANAT, BAFU ...). Right now the Swiss Seismological Service presents many different maps which are interesting for experts but not for lay people. Here it is not helpful to give recommendations how to improve the readability of maps only experts need (e.g. lines 519ff), referee #2 talked about “irrelevant (?)” information. The information of the Swiss Seismological Service would be evaluated as “to complex” by Hagemeyer-Klose and me (cited in lines 182f). Thus, the question of the conclusion section could be how the information of the service could be improved to initiate preparedness actions.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2019-112>, 2019.

C2