

Interactive comment on “Mapping Individual Earthquake Preparedness in China” by Guochun Wu et al.

Guochun Wu et al.

ziqiang.han@qq.com

Received and published: 26 March 2018

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Mapping Individual Earthquake Preparedness in China
(nhess-2017-391)

Authors' Responses to the Reviewers' Comments

We thank the anonymous reviewer for your constructive feedback. We have addressed all your concerns, incorporated your suggestions, and below is a detailed memo documenting the changes we made to the manuscript. Please note that we only answered the negative comments/concerns in this memo. The changes in the manuscript are highlighted in yellow. Comment 1: Although the statistics used are valid - it is not clear what the research questions are. These should be clear and then the results should

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



be presented in the order of these questions.

Authors' Response: Thanks very much for the constructive comment. We have rewritten the last paragraph of the Introduction section, and stated our research questions clearly. The results were presented in the order of the research questions. The last paragraph of the Introduction section is as following: "By analyzing this national representative sample, we characterized the individual's earthquake preparedness in China. In detail, the central questions of concern are: (1) will residents in the west of China (proximity to earthquake) have higher degrees of preparedness in general? (2) Would people with higher risk perceptions to an earthquake (e.g., the concern of disaster risk reduction and the concern of building safety) have a higher degree to preparedness; and (3) is participation in public affairs associated with higher degrees of earthquake preparedness? Besides the national representativeness of the data, we novelly explored the correlation between public involvement and the adoptions of disaster preparedness activities in China."

Comment 2: Was there a power analysis conducted prior to data collection? Please clarify.

Authors' Response: We appreciate this comment. Honestly, we did not conduct power analysis prior to data collection, because we planned to collect a large sample data, and thus the number of observations would be and actually is much larger than the minimum needs.

Comment 3: Finally, there are also some minor technical issues that need to be addressed (for example, use of contractions in the paper).

Authors' Response: Thanks for this comment. We have addressed all the contractions issues and other technical issues, reporting the full names when they appeared at the first time.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess->

2017-391, 2017.

NHESSD

[Interactive
comment](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

