

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_122200
Title of the Manuscript:	AWARENESS AND PREPAREDNESS OF PUPILS TOWARDS DISASTER RISK REDUCTION MANAGEMENT: BASIS FOR INTERVENTION PROGRAM
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>"Awareness and Preparedness of Pupils Towards Disaster Risk Reduction Management: Basis for Intervention Program"</p> <p>1. Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conciseness: The abstract is well-structured but could be more concise. Consider focusing on key findings and implications while reducing repetition. • Details: Include specific statistical results or key numbers that highlight the strength of the relationships found in the study. <p>2. Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and Focus: The introduction provides a good overview, but it could be more focused. Some sections seem to deviate slightly from the central theme of the study, such as the detailed reference to Nepal's earthquake. Consider streamlining this to maintain a clear focus on the context of the Philippines. • Global Context: While it's great that you included global context, make sure it directly relates to the specific study context. Highlighting the importance of disaster preparedness in the Philippine context first would strengthen the narrative. • Literature Review: Consider incorporating more of a structured literature review. Summarize key studies and their findings related to disaster risk reduction in schools, particularly in the Philippines or similar contexts. <p>3. Research Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and Specificity: The objectives are clear, but you might want to rephrase them for better clarity. For instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "To assess the level of disaster risk reduction management awareness among elementary pupils in terms of disaster-related knowledge, awareness, and readiness." ○ "To evaluate the preparedness of elementary pupils in disaster risk reduction management in terms of assessment and planning, physical and environmental protection, and response capacity." ○ "To examine the relationship between disaster risk reduction management awareness and preparedness among elementary pupils." <p>4. Method:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Details on Sampling: The method section is detailed, but you might want to clarify how stratified random sampling was executed. For example, did you stratify by grade level, gender, or other criteria? • Instrumentation: It's important that you describe the reliability and validity of the modified research questionnaire. Were there any pilot tests or previous studies that used this questionnaire? Mention how the survey was adapted from previous studies to fit the specific context of your study. • Ethical Considerations: You've mentioned the right to withdraw, which is good. Ensure you also cover other ethical considerations, such as informed consent and data confidentiality. <p>5. Presentation of Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity: In Table 1, consider reformatting for clarity. It seems that there might be a mix-up in the columns, as the total number of students might be presented differently. <p>6. Conclusion and Recommendations (Assuming they are included later):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention Program: Based on your findings, make clear, actionable recommendations for the intervention program. How can schools improve their disaster risk reduction strategies based on the study? • Future Research: Suggest areas for further research, particularly those that could address any limitations in your study. <p>7. General Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency: Ensure that all sections follow a consistent style and tone. 	

Review Form 3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language and Grammar: Review the document for grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure improvements. For example, avoid long, complex sentences where shorter ones could be more effective. • References: Make sure all citations are correctly formatted according to the required citation style, and ensure that all references are current and relevant. <p>8. Final Touches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Editing: Consider a final round of editing for coherence and flow. Each section should smoothly lead to the next. • Figures and Charts: If applicable, consider including figures or charts to visually represent key data, which could make your findings more accessible. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Niranchana Shri Viswanathan
Department, University & Country	REVA University, India