

Gc-2022-8 Final decision

Thanks to both the reviewers for addressing the vulnerable points of this paper. In particular, I would like to emphasize what suggested reviewer #1 when writing:

“the results section is very hard to read. I had to read many sentences several times to fully understand what was being communicated. My advice is to divide the results section into three parts: (1) have the number of weather hazards news article increased since 2017?; (2) which weather hazards receive the most attention in news articles?; and (3) how often is climate change discussed in these news articles in relation to weather hazards?. Each section could be discussed in 3 or 4 sentences, giving more space for the discussion.”

I would like also to stress that it is important to reorganize the figures and tables in order to help the reader to understand at a glance which are the results of the research. To this respect what suggest rev.#1 for Table1 is of pivotal importance (having also the data for the weather hazards per year would help the reader to compare the frequency of the events with the frequency of the reporting). The author can also consider to add a final table to summarize all the data to motivate the bias found in the media reporting extreme weather events once clarified why it is important to address it.

Also adding a paragraph on the approximate damage caused by different weather hazards in the last five years would add value to the article as suggested by rev#2, since, as we know, damage amount is what very often makes an event newsworthy.

Being confident that Brimicombe will fulfil all the reviewers 'requests, I will be happy to read a more organized version of this paper before accepting for publication.