

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 Professor Di Baldassarre,

thank you very much for your comments and suggestion to improve our paper. About your first idea to include this research into the current socio-hydrology or better say human-environment interaction debate is a great idea and we will include it as a theoretical framework and to apply it to our results.

Therefore, we will add two more chapters: first, introduction which deals with the debate within the socio-hydrology / human-environment interaction and a second one, which we would like to distinguish our conclusion and discussion chapter into one

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



chapter about discussion and one chapter about conclusion, whereabouts we would like to provide the feedback loop to our theoretical concept.

About the second comments: we will add some hydrological data to provide a better understand about, which type of flooding we will talk and how the different study sites were affected in the past years.

Third point: we short it, but it's a quite important issue for the results in the Evros study site. The political dimension lead the individual behaviour (response to past flood events) within this catchment and if we go back to the socio-hydrology debate (especially within your paper published in 2013 and 2015) the problematic of transboundary flood risk management and individual response to it, is not entirely covered, nevertheless, you covered the political dimension, but the points blaming, upstream-downstream or transboundary conflicts, implementation of EU Floods Directive between EU and non-EU countries increase the complexity, which we try to answer in our paper. Therefore, the political dimension has to be included (but shorter) and we will open again the debate later within the discussion part.

Fourth point: true, we correct this part. We are very sorry for this confusion.

Fifth point: again, we correct this part, we only asked people who were affected from past events. Again, sorry for this mistake.

Sixth point: we largely re-wrote this part, first to show more the differences of how different types of floods (processes and characteristic) influence the communities and above all the response to it. Therefore, we split this chapter into discussion and conclusion.

Last point: yes, we totally agree and we will largely re-wrote this part and also to provide a feedback loop to our new theoretical framework as well as to show the potential implication for policy makers and society also outside the two case studies.

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