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Reviewer's report:

The general concept of the paper is good; however, the major revision of the paper is advised for clarity. For instance, the authors should clarify what they mean by "exposure” in the title, and all through the paper. Attention should be paid to language as well. Please refer to other comments below:

Abstract

Background: Stating what the exposure is rather than just saying exposure makes the sentence clearer to the reader.

The "relationship referred to here is not clear i.e. are you looking at the mediating effect of risk perception and social support on earthquake exposure and psychological health?

Suggest the word "could" to be replace with "was"

Main Text

Background (General comment - too long; consider revising)

Lines 51-55: Please explain or provide an example to support your statement on the relationship between perception of risk and post-disaster mental health
2nd Paragraph Line 29: Please revise...are the authors suggesting a NEGATIVE correlation between exposure and Psychological health (e.g. PTSD?). Exposure should also be qualified for clarity.

3rd Paragraph Lines 48-58: Please clarify what you mean by "people". Consider being as specific as possible. Also consider revising the word "Obviously" in line 58.

Line 14: Reference as necessary the statement …"Earthquake risk perception causes people to feel great panic and fear". Also consider deleting the statement that follows; This has already been mentioned above.

Please explain briefly in the background how "level of exposure" was measured e.g., described as low (0-1 event), ...

Methods

Line 52: Consider clarifying "Pre-arranged schedule". What is the schedule?

Measure

Results

Demographic characteristics and exposure

Lines 23-24: What makes them ineligible?

Lines 43: Does this refer to the remaining 32.7% which would be about a third of your sample and the authors already mentioned 30.9% still lived in rented houses.

Mediating effect of risk perception

Line 53: Please specify the variables that are being referred to as "above"
Lines 10-14: Consider revising for clarity i.e., It's not clear how demographic variables can be controlled for demographic variables - gender, age, ethnicity etc. The sentence needs to be revised

Risk perception characteristics

This sentence is not clear. It's not clear how demographic variables can be controlled for demographic variables - gender, age, ethnicity etc. The sentence needs to be revised

Discussion

Overall, the authors repeatedly used the terms "mediating effect", "moderating effect", "positive relation", "negative effect" rather than describing what these effects or relations are. The discussion section should be used to clarify the authors' research findings and provide specific information to support these findings.

Line 36: Please specify which findings differed from previous studies (i.e, "Many of our findings are consistent with previous studies, while some varied because")

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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