

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 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: Basically, this paper is interesting. Especially the questionnaire data

from almost all the provinces of China, sample following the population structure, are valuable and one of the results that participation in public issues is positively related to preparedness is quite interesting even in the socio-political context of China. I think that this paper could be accepted with some minor revisions and that to make this paper better the followings should/could be revised: (1) the novelty of this paper is not necessarily clear even though it can be understood easily. Not only uniqueness of the data but the novelty of question(s) should be written more clearly in the introductory section in relation to the purpose of this paper.

Authors' Response: Thanks a lot for reminding us of this important point. We have rewritten the last paragraph of the introduction section, to make the novelty of the paper and the research questions clearer. "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: (2) The literature review is very much convenient for understanding the research trends, but it should be more focused on the topics directly related to the purpose of this paper.

Authors' Response: Thanks very much for this constructive suggestion. We have rewritten the introduction section, especially the paragraph 3 and 4 to make the literature review more concise and directly related.

Comment 3: (3) For Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, it is better to use a choropleth map, not a chart

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

map (bar chart). And, if possible, a brief explanation could be added in Section 3.1 (p.7) referring to Fig. 1.

Authors' Response: Thanks for the reviewer's kindness comment. We have replaced the Fig.3 and Fig.4 using choropleth maps. We also added one brief explanation referring to Fig.1 at the end of Section 3.1. "Compared to the historical earthquake records in China (Fig. 1), the people in the west of China, where have more earthquake records had higher degree of preparedness."

Comment 4: (4) It might be desired to put detail explanations in the discussion part, about why public participation is related to preparedness in the context of China, referring to some social theories.

Authors' Response: Thanks for the reviewer's constructive comment. We have added more discussion about public participation and the disaster preparedness in the discussion section.

Comment 5: (5) Discussion of the paper's limitation should be moved to the concluding section. Authors' Response: Thanks for the reviewer's suggestion. We noticed that the many relevant articles published in this journal had the limitation in discussion section. So we would like to keep it in the discussion section rather than the conclusion section. But we would like to communicate with the reviewer for potential change if the reviewer insisted.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-391>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

