

Referee 1

I found it refreshing to see an evaluation of this program after it had been running for over a year. Many such programs do not publish such results and it is good to see that there is an impact on the community. I think this provides valuable insight for others that may embark on this kind of program and it certainly shows it's worth.

Thank you very much.

I think the distinction between risk and hazard could perhaps help risk perceptions. I am not sure how much help the statistical calculations are as although they are discussed in the method they are ignored after that.

Thank you for your suggestion to distinguish between hazard and risk. We will investigate whether the age of the students makes this approach suitable. A repeated survey in 1-2 years may inform us how perceptions change on the mid-term.

Regarding statistical calculations: the Discussion section and the Supplementary Table 1 shows the results. We do not discuss how much change occurred as long as they are significant.

The way in which the percentages are reported can be a little confusing for example on line 161 it says 65% of students believed they could survive in 2020 but then compares this to 57% could NOT survive in 2018. Would this not be better as 43% thought they could survive in 2018 and 65% in 2020.

Yes, it is better to write it that way and we have changed the sentence accordingly.

Despite this the results look clear to me and show that while there is more work to do in preparedness the program is definitely having an impact. It would be good to see a complete questionnaire in the supplementary materials as this could help other programs evaluate their effectiveness in the future (I can't see the question about the seismometer there)

Thank you for this suggestion. We have now inserted the complete questionnaire in the supplementary material.