

Interactive comment on “Assessment of flood risk perceptions and adaptation capacity: a comparative study between rural and peri-urban areas in Greece” by K. Karagiorgos et al.

K. Karagiorgos et al.

sven.fuchs@boku.ac.at

Received and published: 2 September 2016

Dear anonymous referee,

Thank you very much for your fast response and very fruitful comments and suggestions to improve our paper.

First point about the research questions: we will re-write the introduction section in order to clarify the gaps and to better show the research questions of our work.

Second point about the questionnaires, survey etc. This is very classical approach, used largely into the social science debate. The questions were asked with a door-to-door technique; about the sampling: we selected people based on to represent the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



population within the two study areas as well as the recruiting is based on a snowballing technique. Nevertheless, of course we conducted a pilot survey with our students to test our questions. About the questions: we in total asked 76 questions, divided into following main sections: (1) socio-economic questions about the interviewee (such as gender, current job position, education etc.), (2) question on social vulnerability (such as local embeddeness in the communities, social networks/social capital, household structure etc.), (3) question on the impact and experience of the past flood events as well as about compensation, (4) risk constructions and awareness and (5) question on lessons learnt. We will clarify these concerns in the methods section.

Third point: the selection of the sampling fits within the socio-economic structure within the two case studies, especially in terms of gender and age. We will clarify this in the methods section.

Fourth point: this indeed is a weak point, which we will solve in the next version of the manuscript once we have the general acceptance of the responsible Editor to do so.

Fifth point: since the current figures and tables are in the line within the social science domain and therefore are state-of-the-art, we honestly see only little chances for a further improvement.

Sixth point: once we have the general acceptance of the responsible Editor, we will conduct a new chapter with the title conclusion and provide a more fruitful discussion how our study is linked and can contribute to the current socio-hydrology debate as well as to show the policy implication outside our study sites.

Last point: This paper provides a further step within the socio-hydrology discussion, which is currently more a theoretical concept with the first tries to translate it with empirical research. Firstly, we use the socio-hydrology debate to analyse and to assess our empirical data and provide a next step within the theoretical discussion; therefore, this paper provide will also provide the link to the Panta Rhei discussion. Further, the paper focus on following aims and scope of the journal: water-related natural hazards

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



and the interaction between hydrological and societal processes within the earth system

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-298, 2016.

HESD

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

