

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JESBS_111350
Title of the Manuscript:	THE LEVEL OF DISASTER PREPAREDNESS IN PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN NAIROBI COUNTY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>The manuscript holds statistical relevance and value as it gives insight into a burning topic in recent years. The data given here is not properly referenced by number, but are passively referenced. The conclusion is definitely fine but the recommendation could have practical and prioritization wise implementable acts recommended there, which here is pretty generic and could have been handled better, and could be important and valuable.</p> <p>The title of the article is definitely on point and is suitable but the inclusion of Kenya as a country could be included as it specifies further the data pool and if some reader wants to review papers related to Kenya on the same topic it might be at the front row of the topic.</p> <p>The abstract is on point and comprehensive without side-talk which is good.</p> <p>The subsections are standard and not problematic per say but the referencing is off and could be done better, at least it is not done in standard practice. The previous papers of the same journals are to be seen for proper guidance on referencing.</p> <p>The data given in the manuscript is checked and no problems were found at the review, the design and process of the sampling is explained so it could be called as scientific.</p> <p>As a recent paper the references were ok but could be better, the latest quote is from 2019 where the most recent reference given is 2021, which is fair but could be done better. The standard referencing format with number could be followed for better reading experience.</p> <p>The script itself as a document has value, but the formatting needs to be done properly. For that previous published journals could be very good starting point.</p> <p>In the recommended section prioritization could be given as ideal scenario might not be possible all of the time so what is to be done first then second this could be added like that.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>The language is simple and could be read and understood properly. No specific upgrade is necessary. Quality is fine and scholarly enough.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	