

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118643
Title of the Manuscript:	NATURAL DISASTER MITIGATION STRATEGIES : A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes. The manuscript idea is very interesting, because, in the recent time this is an urgent issue which can killed and displaced many peoples on the globe.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes, the title is suitable</b></li> <li>3. <b>Partially. The abstract is so broad, it should not be greater than one page, including the key words.</b></li> <li>4. <b>The manuscript has not section and subsection (it lack headers). It is difficult to identify the sections and subsection from the written document and it makes biased for the readers.</b></li> <li>5. <b>The listed references are not enough to be confidential and the way of utilizing the citation and reference technique is not correct. There are so many techniques to utilize citation; like Mendeley, endnote etc.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The written manuscript have some grammar errors/repetition</b></li> <li>• <b>The manuscript have not equal line spacing</b></li> <li>• <b>The colour of the written word is not the same (there are black and brown colour)</b></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The conclusion should be rewritten</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Geteneh Teklie Alemu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wollo University, Kombolcha Institute of Technology (KIOT), Ethiopia</b>