



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geographical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGR_45800
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge on the environmental disasters in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: The case of flooding and bush fire in Businga Territory, Nord Ubangi
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise Abstract 2. DRC? 3. Further literature review 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Author must provide details of study design, types of questionnaire questions, actors may be revised as stakeholders. 2. Provide full form of DRC for normal reader 3. A sub section on flooding in introduction will be very useful. Mention several existing literature on flooding and impacts of flooding. Example- Pathak, S., & Ahmad, M. M. (2016). Flood recovery capacities of the manufacturing SMEs from floods: A case study in Pathumthani province, Thailand. International journal of disaster risk reduction, 18, 197-205. Pathak, S., & Ahmad, M. M. (2018). Role of government in flood disaster recovery for SMEs in Pathumthani province, Thailand. Natural Hazards, 93(2), 957-966. Schlef, K. E., Kaboré, L., Karambiri, H., Yang, Y. E., & Brown, C. M. (2018). Relating perceptions of flood risk and coping ability to mitigation behavior in West Africa: Case study of Burkina Faso. Environmental science & policy, 89, 254-265. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All was corrected and thanks for the literature suggestion.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elongate Methods section 2. Revise the figure's text 3. Revise conclusion 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add more into method section including questionnaires, sampling techniques, data analysis tools and methods. 2. The author may revise the text related with every figure in results section to provide justifications towards the findings. 3. The author may revise the conclusion with a flow and mention of the government and other stakeholders "actors" roles. The recommendations could be added along with a future research perspective derived from this study. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Map 2. Length of paper 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Map of the study area will be very beneficial for the paper 2. The author may add more on the length of the paper example include sub sections for floods, stakeholders involved, government disaster management framework existing or not?, etc. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have a small issue in providing the map. Sorry for this. 2. All the revisions are inserted inside the Ms and the length of the paper is appreciable.

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>	