Interactive comment on "Assessing public outreach strategies in cities coping with climate risks" by Rosa Vicari et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 12 June 2018

General Comments: 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. 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?

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

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.

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.

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

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

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