

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_86477
Title of the Manuscript:	THE ROLE OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND EARTHQUAKE OCCURRENCES IN MYANMAR (A Case Study: the 2017 Taikkyi Earthquake)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- It seems that the title should be edited in a way so that the addressee can better understand the topic. The author can use a much accurate title for as an example which aspect of public health is being mentioned?- The title is mentioning: "the role of public health <u>and</u> earthquake occurrences" what does the author mean by "<u>and</u>"? Does he or she means "<u>in</u>"? By using "and" it may mean that the author is not only studding the role of "public health" but also the role of "earthquake occurrences" in Myanmar! As you can understand this topic is too general to have the possibility of study in a single article since the exact area is not been mentioned and is too general! It seems that the author should rearrange the topic based on his/she's aim or aims.- In the "abstract" section the aim of the article should be mentioned clearly! It seems that the aim of the article should be clarified and also the public health in earthquake occurrences as sudden events should be studied and under investigation.- Mentioning sub-committees in the abstract seems unnecessary. In necessary it should be explained in a much accurate manner.- Keywords better be rearranged.- Frankly and logically In introduction section speaking about the drill exercises is informative but it should be clear that when we are speaking about the drill, how is the target group? The people? The non-governmental organisations (NGOs)? Or the responsible officials? These are different level through which the drill or any kind of emergency exercise can be implemented! On the other hand it seems that before the drills are in place the education also should be implemented.- If possible figure number 1 should be replaced since it's not clear for the addressee and should be demonstrated through a higher resolution map. This explanation also refers to figure number 2- The number of the interviews done with the local people and also the method used by the author should be explained more since it's going to be scientifically used in the article. If not an explanation and reason of the number of being interviewed is important.- The pictures used in figure number 3 should be prepared in a much suitable manner to meet the journal's high standards.- It seems that the title of section entitled; "the role of public health and earthquake occurrences" should be paraphrased and adjusted!- It seems that the methodology needs great attention and should be adjusted in a scientific manner.- The findings and the results should be more accurate and detailed- The quality and quantity of the references should be under consideration. More number of up to date references should be used.- The author should explain what has been added to the existing body of knowledge.- The manuscript should be edited from literal and scientific point of view.	Revised
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	