

Responses to comments on egusphere -2025-6376

<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-6376>

“Learning from the past to inform flood risk management: Analysis of public survey data in Belgium on flood early warning and response during the July 2021 flood”

Heather J. Murdock, Daniela Rodriguez Castro, Benjamin Dewals, Anna Heidenreich, and Annegret H. Thieken (Submitted 19 Dec 2025)

In the text below we provide a point-by-point response to the comments made by the referees.

For clarity, our responses are written in Italics.

Community Comment 1 - Julien Magana

<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2025-6376-CC1>

Community Comments

Comment	Response
Very interesting study and I had a very good time reading it, I find it very approachable in the sense that even without prior knowledge we can understand fully the study and its results ! Thank you for this it's very valuable !	<i>Thank you for your remarks, we are pleased to hear that paper is easy to read and that the results are clear.</i>
In Section 1.1 you indicate that you expand the PADM, maybe it can be nice to explain a bit further on the reasons of your expansion, for example go in more depth on why you are separating pre-decision process and perceptions. Then also what can help you is after your figure when you explain why PADM is suitable for your study explain also why it's limited, as this would pave you the way to justify your expansion (which is a very nice addition by the way).	<i>We will add more details on why we explicitly name additional variables within the PADM framework. For example, age, gender, and flood experience have been shown to be relevant “receiver characteristics” based on previous research and so we name them explicitly in the expanded version.</i> <i>In the original version of the model pre-decision processes and perceptions are already separated. This is based on theory about psychological processes. We add credibility as a pre-decision process but otherwise make to no other changes to the PADM model in this section.</i>
For Section 1.2, I think you have a lot of visual elements with a clear timeline and where critical decisions must be taken and when, maybe a simple timeline figure could be a nice addition to this section which is rich in information, it would wrap it up and help the reader understand the stakes for the points further discussed in the paper ! "For an early warning system to be effective, warning messages need to be received by users with a sufficient lead time allowing them to 190 take protective action (called response in Fig. 1)", following up my previous comment, this can be very nicely visually represented in the timeline I described I think.	<i>Thank you for this comment. The overall PADM actually shows the steps of warning reception and response from a behaviour point of view.</i> <i>We propose more strongly linking the steps of the warning chain to the PADM steps but would hesitate to include an additional figure on each step of flood forecasting and warning timeline since we focus on the warning reception and behaviour response part. We will also reference other papers related to this event that do include a timeline.</i>

<p>I think your methodology section is solid, valid and well justified, I really liked how it was split in RQs as well, it gives a very clear overview of how you did the study and makes it replicable.</p>	<p><i>We are happy to hear that the methodology is easy to follow and deemed to be a valid approach.</i></p>
<p>I really like Figure 3 as it wraps up perfectly your results section, maybe you could have intermediary versions of this figure with focus points on the results section and at the end have the overall framework expanded, that way maybe it would make your result section less heavy in text ? A summary table could also be a nice addition at the end of the result section with the main trends found in your results and what recommendations would they lead to potentially? To have this clearer overview of your findings I think that would be a nice addition to work.</p>	<p><i>We agree that a summary table with main findings would be valuable. We wanted to be comprehensive with this summary and include all variables, which is why we moved this summary table to the supplement as Table S3. We could highlight some key findings in the results section more clearly and make it more explicit that a full summary with details on each variable is in the supplement.</i></p>
<p>I would add also limitations in terms of methodology, I think one criticism you could receive (which is very easy and common with survey studies) is that you didn't try to have follow-up interviews to confirm at least part of your findings, this is a classic, so maybe it can be nice to mention it in the limitations !</p>	<p><i>We will add more details on the limitation of this study, e.g. xxx, and recommendations for future work, such as xx.</i></p>
<p>Thank you for the very enjoyable read, great study !</p>	<p><i>Thank you for your comments and for valuing our work.</i></p>