



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>)



SDI 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	<p>There are a lot of grammatical errors observed on the manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract should be written in a continuous flow. • What is the total population of the region under study and of that population what, percentage was approached for the survey? • You mentioned that 72% of the informants had a required level of education to answer the questionnaire, what is the level of education, how did you determine that level of education? • Considering this analysis was conducted in a period of only close to 2 years, how then is it justified to conclude that floods occur every 3 years? • Please rephrase the last sentence of the Abstract. • You cannot state 'Knowledge, Perception and Attitude'; as keywords. <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is strong need to revise the introduction and conduct a thorough literature survey on the topic. State what has been done before, and what you are doing now. Mention your motivation and the identified literature Gap which you will then address in this study. • Check relevant studies for instance you may add the following related script to your literature; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ [1] R. Samu and A. S. Kentel, "An analysis of the flood management and mitigation measures in Zimbabwe for a sustainable future," Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct., vol. 31, pp. 691–697, Oct. 2018. • Outline the importance of your study to the scientific community. <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is need to justify your sample size. Again with reference to relevant studies, why choosing such a sample size. • In your Socio-demographic characterization, what clarify what you mean by, 'function.' • In the last sentence of the methodology section, what do you mean by species identification? • Again there is a need for a thorough revision on the proposed method, and justification as to why the authors believe it is the best methodology to employ. • More clarity is also needed. <p>Results and Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be better and clearer to present results in a bar graph or tabular form; this is with reference to results such as those outlined in figure 1. • Is there any reason as to why there are more males than females in your study? • There is strong need to further discuss the results, not to just write one sentence after every figure. Some of the paragraphs are just 2 or 3 lines long. Have at least five lines per paragraph. 	<p>Thanks for the suggestion for the abstract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfortunately, we didn't ask about the total population of the region. We based on the random sampling which allowed to conduct the study. • The level of education is the highest level that an individual has reached so far in his education process (schooling process). It was determined by questionnaire. • No, the floods occur every 2 years. • Thanks for the suggestion for the abstract and keywords. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for the suggestion. The literature was reviewed thoroughly. The main gap is that less is reported from DRC. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For this section, everything is corrected and was made clear. • What I meant by "function" was duty or post. • No species identification needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have adopted the tabular form. • At the time of the interview, more females were at the field. • The discussion was improved (see Ms). • I kept some figures (5) and other data are presented in tabular form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of presenting so many figures, you can have combo graphs that show relationships prevailing in your analysis and you comment and discuss those. • Please may you cite the source (s) of Figure 25. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reference to the revisions suggested, there is therefore a need to write firm conclusions. • Suggestions of the disaster management and mitigation strategies that can be implemented are also required. • Policy implications can be noted as well. • Any suggested future work should be mentioned. <p>References</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is need to be consistent with the referencing style. • More journal references related to this study are needed, these can be found once a thorough literature is conducted. One suggestion of such references is; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ [1] R. Samu and A. S. Kentel, "An analysis of the flood management and mitigation measures in Zimbabwe for a sustainable future," Int. J. Disaster Risk Reduct., vol. 31, pp. 691–697, Oct. 2018. • For example, [2]. there cannot be any anonymous reference, please be consistent on referencing and how to cite different articles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion as well has been improved.
Minor REVISION comments	Inconsistency with the nomenclature is observed throughout the manuscript. For example, the word 'bushfire' should be written as one word unlike how it written in the manuscript as 'bush fire'. More of these common mistakes prevail and there is a need revise the manuscript.	All is corrected.
Optional/General comments	The study is a good study in general. However, there is a need for a strong revision from both grammar and contents of the manuscript.	

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>	