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General comments

This is a clearly written paper with well justified conclusions based on pre/post surveying of student attitudes, knowledge and behaviors related to earthquake awareness and preparedness. It is impressive to see such a significant effect on student knowledge and their sharing of that increased knowledge with the community after just 2 years. The educational program is very well designed, with a 3-pronged approach of new lessons and lectures taught by the authors, teacher professional development, and the installation of a school seismograph network, all done in collaboration with school leaders. The discussion of the difficulty of changing the perception of risk, even with the documented increase in earthquake hazard knowledge raised a number of interesting points.

Specific comments

This may be outside the scope of the paper, but I’d be interested to know whether the authors have any data, or can speculate as to the relative importance of the 3 components of the program? Particularly, is it possible to show that having a school seismograph increased student engagement beyond what would have occurred with only lessons and lectures taught by the authors and teacher professional development? If such a claim can be made, it would be helpful for the seismographs in schools community.

Line 143: A little more information would be helpful about the question relating to students knowing when an earthquake will occur, as I didn’t quite understand what was being asked. Could you include the full question in the figure 7 caption? That question doesn’t seem to be in the supplement.

Figure 8: I suggest modifying the caption to more closely reflect the question, e.g. Need to avoid making phone calls after earthquake.

Technical/typographic corrections

Line 58: missing comma between awareness and preparations.
Line 99: extra “the” : “and the all the”
Line 166: I think this should be “hit by objects, not collapse of constructions”
Line 240: I think this should be “level was increased”
Line 312: I think this should be “implemented and achieved”
Line 327: I think this should be “allowed us to invite”
Table 1, Q11: I think this should be “preparedness for a major”