

Review of: "An approach to the background, methods and challenges of research in disasters"

Dr. Yousuf Rebeeh

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The main intention of this paper Author is to develop a literature review paper on methods and challenges of research work related to disasters, as I understood from the context and description of the paper.

In general, the paper is not ready for publishing yet and need to improve and reinforced the following aspects:

- The overall used English language need to be improved and organized in better way to give clear meaning and consistency of the presented ideas in the paper. The overall wording need to be written in clear way and provide proper definitions and consistency to ensure presenting proper meaning and avoid wrong understanding or interpretation by readers.
- The Author in some locations also jumps from one idea to another without proper connection or links of the ideas which confuse the reader (This is notice in introduction paragraph as well as others) .
- In The Method paragraph, it's not clearly mentioned the Methodology used in the literature review such as approached used in selected sample papers, numbers, time frame for selecting the papers.....etc. Such important information shall be highlighted to keep the reader in the context and define the used methodology in the paper.
- In the result part, I was expecting more numbers and statistics to support the given conclusions statements, but unfortunately this part was lacking such supporting evidence on study findings and analysis.
- Similarly on the discussion part, no supporting numbers, evidence or statistics presented to support or reject any statements which is very strange. This part need to be supported by evidence from the literature review analysis, define clearly the terminology and terms used in the text.
- Some of the argument statements in the discussion part at which Author gives his personal opinion need to be supported from his findings and previous literature including general statements that might be applied for very specific cases only.
- In the conclusion part, we notice the same trend that no any supporting evidence or statistics to any of the conclusions or ideas given in this part which make it very difficult to be digested or accepted by readers.

I suggest conducting competed review of this paper and support to before publishing as highlighted in above points.

Thanks

Yousuf Rebeeh

