

Interactive comment on “The Met Office Weather Game: investigating how different methods for presenting probabilistic weather forecasts influence decision-making” by Elisabeth M. Stephens et al.

Skinner (Referee)

c.skinner@hull.ac.uk

Received and published: 10 January 2019

This paper highlights the results of a game-based survey into how people interpret probabilistic meteorological forecasts, focusing on temperature and likelihood of rain. The paper is well researched, written, and presented, and will be of interest to readers of Geoscientific Communication as it demonstrates how game-based methods can be used to engage the public with complex scientific information, and the best ways to present it so they can make decisions which are more likely to be advantageous. It is especially interesting as the methods of presentation surveyed have since been

adopted for public forecast communication.

The focus of the manuscript is very firmly on the survey results, their interpretation, and what they mean to the communication of probabilistic information. Details of the game itself – the theoretical framework, design, and development process – are limited but I appreciate that this isn't the scope of this manuscript. However, personally, I hope the authors do choose to share this in the future, possibly as supplementary material or further publication.

I have recommended that this paper be accepted with minor corrections –

Text in Figure 1 is small and cannot be read easily on a print out of the manuscript. Please consider a way of making this text larger (possibly flipping the image 90 degrees and filling the page).

In Section 2.1.3. consider expanding the description of the Briers Score for those might not be familiar with it – what does it measure, where is it used, and why it is an appropriate measure for this.

The authors use the term 'correct' to describe a user choice which is considered the probabilistically-speaking best option. This does not seem right to me – in a scenario where a user selects the best, or most sensible, option but gets rained on, I'm not sure a user would consider they had been 'correct but unlucky' (Line 313), but instead that it was the wrong choice. A user might instead opt for another location which is not such a probabilistically good choice maybe because they had a 'hunch' that the better option might rain, despite the odds. If their chosen location stays dry, then it was a 'correct' decision for them. This likely has little impact on this particularly survey, but if more complexity was added to the game such as each location having different footfall, the user begins to make decisions based on multiple criteria and the idea of one single choice being the correct one is not valid. The decision to interpret only one option as the correct one seems to be a deterministic way to interpret a probabilistic problem. I freely admit this is a trivial point on terminology but I'd be interested to hear the authors'

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

thoughts on it, and am happy for them to say I am wrong and move on.

Page 22, Lines 194 and 195 require a space between them.

Data Availability – Data ought to be available freely using an online repository with a DOI attached. If this is not possible, and it can only be made available under license, then details of how this can be obtained need to be included here before final publication.

Acknowledgements – Are there any project or grant codes which can be included here.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2018-17>, 2018.

GCD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

