

## ***Interactive comment on “Assessing public outreach strategies in cities coping with climate risks” by Rosa Vicari et al.***

**Rosa Vicari et al.**

rosa.vicari@enpc.fr

Received and published: 20 June 2018

We would like to thank Reviewer 1 for his time to review our manuscript and to provide valuable comments and suggestions. We will address all issues raised in the critique and we believe that our manuscript will be much stronger after addressing these comments. Hopefully the changes implemented will satisfy his requirements. Here we would like to list our preliminary responses to the items raised by the Reviewer:

1)

"The paper asks some interesting questions, but fails to deliver. The writing is confusing and the arguments don't flow very well. Good framing of resilience and a fair amount of evidence from the literature. The methodology used is not clear at all, it's very vague."

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



We appreciate that the Reviewer expressed his interest for the research questions addressed in this paper. We believe that the paper doesn't fail to deliver, since the objective of this research is:

- To compare different techniques to assess communication quality and quantity;
- And highlight their strengths and weaknesses in the operational context of a communication campaign on flood resilience.

However we recognise that the following additions to the text would improve the clarity of the paper:

- Adding a presentation of the research rationale, purpose and questions in the Introduction;
- Adding a section dedicated to the methodology;
- Adding a section focusing on the results and discussion.

2)

"For example, there is no information on the sample used. For example, p13: "For this first evaluation a small sample was selected, since the main aim was to test a methodology that can be applied to different case studies. In order to perform a comparative experiment, a control group of respondents, who didn't attend the exhibition, was selected. " What is the sample size? How were the respondents identified and recruited? How many in the control group?"

As highlighted by the Reviewer, some of the information on the methodology is not specified or it's only indicated in the figures and not in the main text. The new section on the methodology will include information on the size of the sample and the control group, as well as on the identification and recruitment processes for each experiment presented in the paper.

3)

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

"Title - it would be good to clarify what exactly are the authors assessing. Is it the impact of outreach strategies? Something else?"

We understand the Reviewer concern with the title, we are considering to replace it with "Assessing the impact of outreach strategies in cities coping with climate risks".

4)

"The authors need to tidy-up the introduction a bit and make better use of paragraphs, for example. The text doesn't flow as well as it could if good punctuation, paragraphs, etc. was used."

We also understand his concern about the text of the Introduction and we intend to review the punctuation, paragraph divisions and those sentences that might be unclear.

5)

"Figure 1: this needs to be re-done. It's very hard to understand who much each bar accounts for as there's no scale. Also, you can't read the Y in full, for example "number of academic articles published based on" - based on what?? Overall, all figures are confusing and difficult to interpret. The quality of the figures is not appropriate for publishing, they are more report-style."

We agree with the Reviewer that Figure 1 should be improved by adding the amounts concerning 2010-2012 (that are currently missing) and by checking that all the text in the chart is readable. Concerning the other figures, we will verify if all the information is complete and readable, and if the legends are sufficiently clear.

6)

"References are included in the conclusions section, as well as refs to figures - this is not appropriate for an academic journal."

We thank the Reviewer for pointing out that references shouldn't be included in the conclusions. We intend to overcome this problem by dividing the text of the conclusions

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

in two parts:

- A section dedicated to the Results and Discussion (that will include the references);
- A section dedicated to the Perspectives (without references).

7)

"Technical corrections: Overall the paper would benefit from being reviewed by a native English speaker"

We are in absolute agreement with the Reviewer concerning the need to benefit from a copy-editing service since the authors aren't English native speakers.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2018-4>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

