

Interactive comment on “A “Mental Models” approach to the communication of subsurface hydrology and hazards” by H. Gibson et al.

H. Gibson et al.

hazel.gibson@plymouth.ac.uk

Received and published: 11 April 2016

Thank you very much for your comments, which I will address below:

1. Thank you for this comment – I have attempted to address the issue of language, particularly the use of heuristics and snowball sampling. 2. Yes I agree, and an example of how poor communication can lead to misconceptions has been added: p2 line 70-76 3. Thank you for this comment, some additional detail has been added to clarify the meaning of this diagram: p5 lines 192-196 4. This is a very interesting suggestion, thank you. Although it would be useful to suggest an alternative method for communicators and geologists who don't have the time to complete the full method, the central aim of this paper is to make a case for using the mental models method to improve the quality and relevance of communication between both expert and non-expert par-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



ties. As such I don't feel that I can offer a shorter or more compressed version of this method without doing a disservice to the process.

Additional comments:

P1 line 32 – yes, this has been altered P2 line 44 – yes, a sentence has been added to clarify the meaning of heuristics (line 46-47) P2 line 77 – yes, an example of the messages have been added (line 97-101) P7 line 212 – yes, additional information has been added to clarify (line 248) P7 line 224 – no, a single questionnaire is produced, additional information has been added to clarify (line 257-262) P8 line 252 – hydrological interactions were chosen because they were unexpected, additional information has been added to clarify (line 309-311) P8 line 260 – yes, this has been altered P9 line 287 – yes an additional sentence has been added to provide more information about snowball sampling (line 353-357) P13 line 403 – yes, this is an error – there is an image for 3e, but this reference does not refer to it (also this figure has been changed to Figure 4) P 16 line 529 – yes, thank you, this was confusing – it has been altered (line 622)

Figure 1 – yes, this has been altered (Figure 1)

Figure 3 – yes, this has been altered (is now Figure 4)

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2015-542/hess-2015-542-AC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2015-542, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper






Fig. 1.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper






Fig. 2.



Fig. 3.

C5

HESSD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper





Fig. 4.




Fig. 6.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)






Fig. 7.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

