

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., community comment CC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-152-CC1>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Comment on nhess-2022-152

Li Peng

---

Community comment on "Public intention to participate in sustainable geohazard mitigation: an empirical study based on an extended theory of planned behavior" by Huige Xing et al., Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-152-CC1>, 2022

---

The author selected some villages prone to geohazards in Jinchuan County as the research area. Based on TPB and extended TPB theory, and using semi-structured interview data, the author quantitatively analyzed the influence of BA, SN and other factors on the willingness of rural residents to participate in disaster prevention and mitigation activities. Besides, the study found many interesting conclusions that are consistent with the actual situation of the region, and put forward relevant policy recommendations, which can help improve the risk prevention awareness of rural residents and promote the construction of regional resilient communities. The study meets the journal's requirements and seems reasonable, but there are still several important questions. Specific questions are as follows:

#1. Sample selection problem.

- How did the author sample 260 households? How representative is this of the region? This section should be explained in more detail.
- The author said that " The main survey was ... Shaer Township, Desheng Village, Danzamu Village, and Shangengzi Village ...", but I found that Danzamu village and Shangengzi village belong to Shaer Township, while Desheng Township belongs to Kaer Township. Author verification is required here.

#2. In "2.1 Theory of planned behavior", if possible, it is suggested to increase the application of BA, SN and PBC factors in the research related to geohazards, because the current content is not integrated with geohazards and disaster reduction.

#3. In "2.2 Risk perception", the citations is too old. For example, Lindell & Hwang, 2008 and Martin et al. (2009) suggest updating or adding recent relevant studies.

#4. The choice of method. SEM was used to obtain good results in this study. However, the author does not elaborate in depth why this method is used. That is, the particularity of this method compared with other conventional methods in the field of disaster reduction research needs further elaboration.

#5. In" 3.1 Study area", the author said " Jinchuan County has 421 types of geological

disaster sites ", here refers to the identified potential geological disaster points? In addition, in what year were the 421 potential disaster spots identified? 2016, 2022 or whatever.

#6. Some contents of "5.1 Factors intention to participate" are more appropriate in the results, especially 1), 2), 3) and 4). Therefore, it is suggested that the author adjust and reorganize the structure of the discussion part.

#7. Problems with In-text citations and reference.

- Incorrect formatting of citations and references, for example, line 42 "Seidler, Dietrich, Schweizer, Bawa, & Khaling, 2018", "Cwa & Sjc, 2020", Should be changed to "Seidler et al.,2018", "Cwa and Sjc, 2020 ". please refer to the website for specific requirements (NHES - Submission (natural-hazards-and-earth-system-sciences.net)).
- Lines 662-661, "Zhang, J. (2016). Report on Detailed Investigation Results of Geological Hazards in Jinchuan County, Aba Prefecture, Sichuan Province. Retrieved from", the reference information is incomplete.

#8. In the Disaster Experience (DE3) in Table 1, "geological" should be deleted. In addition, there are several occurrences of "geological disaster(s)" and "geohazard(s)". It is advisable to distinguish the differences between the two expressions and try to be uniform.

#9. Professional editing for this manuscript is needed. Some expressions are not professional. Though it's understandable.