

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2022-152-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on nhess-2022-152

Md. Shibly Sadik (Referee)

Referee 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-RC1>, 2022

I congratulate the authors for this interesting research. This research shows us a way, how to improve people's behavior toward disaster risk reduction. It has systematically explored the factors influencing or affecting the participation of the community in disaster risk management. However, there are a few places that require minor revision and clarification to improve the readability of the manuscript.

- first, for example, participation in disaster mitigation is the core of this paper, but this participation has not been clearly defined. It is necessary to clearly define what this participation means, and what would be the roles and responsibilities of the community/individual if they need to participate. Especially during the questionnaire survey, the respondent must be explained clearly about the activities to be performed by the community if they participate in disaster risk management. Because the measurement of the independent factors would be different for different activities. For example, behavioral attitudes (perception on advantages and disadvantages) towards evacuation drills would be different than their attitude towards joining in a discussion with the government regarding the preparation of a plan.
- The methodology section vaguely mentions about Likert scale as a tool used for measuring a variable. A further explanation is needed on how each of the variables was measured, how the Likert scale was developed for each case, whether the scores provided by the respondent were number or rank or interval, etc.
- The author interchangeably used "Intent to Participate" and "willingness to participate". It is better to be consistent while using this kind of terminology.
- It is not clear from the manuscript whether the hypothesis and the testing results are context-bound or universal. I think the results are context-bound. The result might be different in different geographical locations, and different communities. For example, in a case of a community that has recently experienced a disaster, the disaster experience and risk perception might be found positively and significantly correlated with participation intention. Therefore, the statements and propositions made in this paper need to be carefully placed.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2022-152/nhess-2022-152-RC1-supplement.pdf>