Response to Editor’s comments

1. Technical corrections are needed to clarify some aspects of the findings. I assume that where you have "p=0.000", this is because SPSS displays 0.000, but if you click on it, it will give you a precise number. Please go through the MS and tables, and change 0.000 to "<0.001". Simply 0.000 is not accurate.
Ans: Thanks for the recommendations. We have revisited SPSS and click on the P value and the P values for “fear of earthquake” in Gender and Occupation are 0.000000. Therefore, we have added the notes in the end of the tables and revised the values in the results. (Please see line 170, Table 3, and Table 7).

2. Please also go through the results section again and check for clarity - in particular, in the House ownership section, you state that people were more willing to retrofit after the EQ, which contradicts everything else! Please make sure that this section is very clear and reflects the tables and figures.
Ans: Thanks for the comments, and the description in house ownership is inaccurate. The results have been reviewed carefully to avoid any contradicts. (Please see line 226-228)

“Overall, regardless of house ownership category, people tended to become more aware of earthquakes and less willing to retrofit their houses in the postearthquake survey.”

3. Finally, please revisit the conclusion and ensure that it is a clear summary of the findings. The "limitations" should be a new paragraph - at the moment it is too abrupt.
Ans: Thanks for the comments. Couple things in the conclusion section have not been revised last time. The section has been rewritten and added up a paragraph for limitation. (Please see line 273-287)

“ This study tends to explore the changes in risk perceptions and adaptation behaviors based on various socioeconomic characteristics before and after earthquake disasters. However, there are multiple limitations faced in this study. There are two surveys (October to December 2014, and May 2016) conducted in the study area. The predisaster survey was a street survey, while the postdisaster survey was a telephone survey based on phone number databases within the study area. Although the questions were the same in the two surveys, the interviewees in the pre- and postearthquake surveys were different. In addition, Meinong earthquake was a magnitude 6.6 earthquake caused 744 buildings reported as having been damaged, and in particular, one building fully collapsed, resulting in 115 deaths. It was a devastating earthquake but only caused one building fully collapsed. Such disaster experience might not necessary increase the awareness of buildings anti-seismic effect. The results
might not be applicable to any other disaster events, only earthquakes.

To sum up, the results can provide a general tendency regarding changes in risk perceptions and adaptation behaviors pre- and postdisaster events and the variations between different socioeconomic characteristics based upon Taiwanese disaster experience. The findings can serve as a reference to formulate risk communication strategies and for governments to make decisions on the prioritization of risk management policies. However, there are potential topics that could be extended in future studies, such as the correlation between socioeconomic characteristics, the causes and effects of risk perceptions on adaptation behaviors, and others.”