Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-25-RC3, 2020 © Author(s) 2020. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## Interactive comment on "Impact of an educational program on earthquake awareness and preparedness in Nepal" by Shiba Subedi et al.

Lok Bijaya Adhikari (Referee)

lbadhikari@hotmail.com

Received and published: 14 June 2020

I enjoyed reviewing it which covers the major aspects of Geoscience Communication. I found it scientifically sound and useful for the general public. This is a important work to be done in a country like Nepal which has high seismic hazard. Besides some specific, following comments I don't have major comments for the publication.

Specific Comments Line 54: After or before Fig. 1 mention source/reference. Line 54: After magnitude please mention the type of earthquake before the number. Line 61: It is well-refereed NSET, an NGO working in Nepal however, it is worth mentioning similar activities performed by Government agencies like the National Seismological Center under the Department of Mines and Geology, National Reconstruction Authority, De-

C1

partment of Education, Department of Urban Development and Building Construction, etc. Line 125: Revise the spelling "hid". Line 139: Mention the type of magnitude Line 226: It is better to replace regional and central government by the Government of Nepal only. Line 226: Revise the spelling of "survey". Line 227: Write in the correct order. (eg. Local, Provincial and Federal government) Line 386: It is better to define the term Chi-square, p-value, etc. in the main text. Line 388: Table. Why Q1 to Q6 are not mentioned in the same table? Line 524: Fig. 1 add a table about the location of the school. eg. Lat, Lon, place name, type of school public or privet, number of students, staff, etc. Line 527: Fig. 2 where and which school is this? Line 553: Fig. 4 Correct Nepali word (1. Parba to Purba). In the same figure, some texts are cropped in the bottom row. Line 562: Fig. 5 on-wards, eg. April 2018 (318) and January 2020 (480). As discussed in the main text, the respondents are not repeated from 2018 survey to 2020 survey, it is worth to compare and discuss the variation among the repeated ones.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-25, 2020.