

Dear Hazel Gibson, Charlotte Kämpf and Erwin Zehe,

Thank you all very much for your thorough reading of our manuscript and the helpful comments provided. We are happy to read your positive feedback and we agree that we can be a bit more specific about the various meanings of jargon. We will add references to the suggested literature, and elaborate more on the topic in the revised manuscript.

Concerning your specific questions, we will address them here one by one - please find *your original comments* in *italic*.

** In particular the phenomenon on intermodality, switching between modes of communication channels, should be addressed as well as the various meanings of 'jargon' - the authors are advised to consult any of the available technical / science communication paper textbooks.*

As we understand it, your remark can point both to the intermodality of the text versus pictures, or to the intermodality in the method of surveying (on paper versus on iPad). In both cases we agree it is worth elaborating about the impact. We will add references to relevant papers that studied intermodality in science communication as well as in survey design.

** In a paper on ambiguity of terminology, the frame addressed (here 'jargon') should also be tested for ambiguity. A short look at administrative efforts globally to transpose academic language (jargon?) into plain language would make a fine addition.*

We agree that in a paper on ambiguity we should make clear there is no ambiguity to the definition of “jargon” that we use. We will look at administrative efforts globally to transpose academic language into plain language and add relevant citations to important works.

Some terminology should be revised such as 'hydrology induced hazards'

The terminology was chosen to be familiar to the readership of HESS. We will closely review our manuscript to make sure our terminology is also clear for those outside of hydrology.

In addition more care should be given to labeling illustrations such as Fig 3 (the comment on the meaning of the star should not stay in the bodytext - it should go into a legend for this figure).

We thank you for pointing this flaw out. We fully agree and will change this in the manuscript.

Firstly, in the method section, it is not made clear how exactly the pictures and definitions used in the survey were actually chosen? If they were written/selected only by a panel of experts with no input from non-experts then that represents a significant limitation in the work as the choices made by the experts may not include important representations that the layperson might have selected. This does not mean that the layperson, when interviewed would not select one of the options regardless, but that actually their true representation was not an option. This would then lead me to ask how representative are the definitions of lay people's definitions?

We agree that describing the method of selecting the images is important in understanding and interpreting the results of our study. In our research the images and terms were selected by experts: the authors and the members of the focus group. We choose this method because it mimics the process of communicating geoscientific expert knowledge to the general public: the initiative is with the expert to craft the message. We agree that from an academic perspective it is interesting to also add the lay people's input in the process of choosing the definitions. We will add a description on how we choose to definitions to the paper. Furthermore, we will add a recommendation that future research could include lay people in the process of selecting definitions.

Secondly, in the presentation of the results, having the numerical data is fantastic and really allows me to pick apart the patterns for myself, but in terms of ease of reading, a bar chart of this data would really help with legibility here.

Our initial thinking was to provide as much raw data as possible. However, we agree that bar charts convey the same information and are more easily read. We will replace the table by a bar charts, and move the table to the supplements.

Thirdly, in the results section, I found the repeated use of the phrase 'no disagreement' quite confusing and it frequently threw me out of the text as I tried to understand what it was saying - if possible the use of the phrase 'agreement' here would make things much easier to follow.

We will change this.

Fourthly it might be useful to the authors to consider some of the work on climate change communication as it may have more parallels to hydrogeological communication than medical (although I really do like Castro's definition of jargon). I would suggest the authors take a look at 'Somerville, R. C., & Hassol, S. J. (2011). Communicating the science of climate change'. Physics Today, 64(10), 48' and 'Nerlich, B., Koteyko, N., & Brown, B. (2010). Theory and language of climate change communication. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 1(1), 97-110' as these have some very relevant sections that will strengthen the context of your work.

Thank you for pointing us to the recommended literature, we will carefully read them and add relevant citations to our manuscript.

There are a few grammatical and text based changes that I have highlighted in the attached pdf as highlights and comments, but overall I think that this is a good paper that, with a few tweaks and a little extra information, very much deserves to be published.

We're glad to hear that! We will make sure to look into the grammatical and spelling errors as well

Again: thanks again for your time and your recommendations, and we will try to get back to you as soon as possible with the new version of our paper!

Kind regards, Gemma Venhuizen, Rolf Hut, Casper Albers, Cathelijne Stoof, Ionica Smeets