

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>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Natural disasters are inevitable or unavoidable. However, we can prevent further risks and loss. To this end, each person is required to be informed and aware about the disasters. Similarly, keeping emergency kits in house and pre plan for evacuation can save life and reduce risk. In the same way, community and social organization plays vital role in disaster mitigation. Most importantly, it is the responsibility of the state to protect its people with effective strategies.</p> <p>Natural disasters are a global concern. Therefore, I appreciate the author for choosing this serious issue. However, the manuscript needs more investigation and proper arrangement of ideas in order to make it more scientific. In addition, following the research design guidelines seems equally important. Overall, this manuscript is very poor. From my perspective, it's not a research article. I think the author himself is confused about what he aims to write, what he is writing and how he is writing. Author needs to learn more about research and academic writing.</p> <p>Risk Mitigation Strategies for Natural Disasters: An Overview (Note: Comprehensive is a broad term)</p> <p>The abstract is comparatively long and could be shortened. Usually the length of the abstract limit is within 150-300 words. Similarly, few ideas are explained unnecessarily. In the same way, the purpose, outcomes, conclusion and argument are not clearly stated. Furthermore, abstract differs from body part.</p> <p>No, the subsections are haphazardly created. The structure is disorganized. This manuscript is not in sandwich model. A good researcher begins each paragraph with own argument and supports it with authentic evidences/data. Indeed, this manuscript looks like an essay. It lacks required study/investigation regards to subject matter.</p> <p>Not even a single scientific evidence has been presented in the manuscript. It lacks authentic definition and data. Most importantly, the abstract, introduction, body and conclusion do not match to each other. When I came to the conclusion part, I was really shocked. For a while, I thought this manuscript was useless.</p> <p>No. This manuscript lacks sufficient references. Indeed, the manuscript does not seem to be a research article.</p> <p>The concept of natural disasters are randomly defined and explained in his own way without references/works cited. The author should read more books, articles and newspapers related to natural disasters to collect required ideas for writing article.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Moreover, the similar ideas are repeated frequently. The Common ideas could be synthesized (e.g. impact of natural disasters). Furthermore, it would be better, if the author focuses on organizing paragraphs, not in bullet points.</p> <p>In the introduction section, the author writes “The examination culminates in a discussion on emerging perspectives which underscore the crucial roles played by both human and non- human entities in every operational setup. By scrutinizing Ants from an ecological standpoint, it argues that effective hazard mitigation and adaptability necessitate consideration not only within their own realm but also in conjunction with other entities involved in the discourse.) But he has not mentioned these things anywhere throughout the manuscript. Indeed, he has become failure to justify his argument.</p> <p>Overall, I suggest author to reorganize/rewrite whole manuscript sincerely.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language is good. However, it lacks parallelism. Some sentences are very complex, while some are very simple. In addition, the author needs to have more ideas about research and academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author needs to correct technical errors (tense, spelling, punctuation marks, use of transition)</p>	

Commented [D1]: What is this? You have not mentioned ecology and ants anywhere throughout your manuscript. How could you argue this?

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rebija Adhikari (Rebati)
Department, University & Country	Nepal