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We very much appreciate the comments provided. The comments were constructive and very encouraging. We have incorporated the suggestions into the manuscript and our responses to the specific comments are as follows (please refer to the AC2 supplement for an updated, but still intermediate version of the manuscript):

- It would be beneficial to include the legal framework of mainstreaming the DRR in Indonesia. It includes the Act No 24 of 2007 on Disaster Management and the Circular letter of the Minister of National Education No. 70a/SE/MPN/2010. It could be a good starting point to emphasize the importance of disaster education in Indonesia. The circular letter explains how the mainstreaming of DRR in the school curricula has been conducted in Indonesia. The review on the implementation process of these three
methods (through the existing subject, local content and extra curricular activities) will give good point for the paper.

Author reply: Comment accepted. Additional information regarding the Indonesian Disaster Management Law and the Circular letter have been inserted in Page 23 Line 6 to 11.

- More information about the school system in Indonesia would be necessary, including the information about the school-based disaster preparedness (Sekolah Siaga Bencana/SSB) and non-SSB schools. Related to the sample, is the sample come from one of this school?

Author reply: Comment accepted. Information regarding Disaster Prepared Schools (SSB) has been inserted in Page 5 Line 13 to 21. Regarding the sample school, the school is part of the government-endorsed Safe School program, supported by a local NGO (additional info has been inserted in Page 11 Line 12-13).

- Do we now discuss the challenge of the DRR education in the new curriculum (Curriculum 2013)? If yes, can I suggest that the author(s) consider analyzing the basic competencies of the Curriculum 2013, which might address the knowledge of hazards? One example is the basic competencies of the science curriculum in middle schools (junior high school) pointed out that students should know about hazards. Is it beneficial to include the knowledge of hazards as part of the curriculum? Why? The finding from the survey might help to answer the questions.

Author reply: At the time of the study, the new curriculum (Curriculum 2013) had not been fully implemented, therefore there was no specific discussion regarding the new curriculum. Nevertheless, integration of disaster education had been completed in the earlier curriculum (Curriculum 2006) and the result of the children’s survey has shown that knowledge of DRR is still low, particularly on flood preparedness and hygiene. Information has been added regarding the 2013 curriculum in Page 25 Line 5-7.
It also would be useful if the author(s) could provide more literatures from the previous research in disaster education in Indonesia. For instance, Indonesia Institute of Science (LIPI) and UNESCO with support from UNISDR developed some criteria and conducted various assessments to evaluate the disaster preparedness at schools in Indonesia. Some schools were appointed as model and involved in the process of infusing knowledge. Some intervention also has been made through the teacher training. The information would be useful to give more understanding on the currents situation and how to improve the condition.

Author reply: Comment accepted. Additional literature on disaster education studies in Indonesia have been inserted in the Introduction (in Page 2 Line 26 to Page 3 Line 3), including Sopaheluwakan et al. (2006) from LIPI. The article has also described current practices in training teachers which is through cascading method, which the article analysed in the Discussion section on Teachers’ capacity in Page 22.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: