

Review of: "Teaching fire safety through design-based immersion of National Building Code-2016 provisions to students of undergraduate architecture: a student feedback on the pedagogy technique"

Barak Pelman¹

¹ Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article deals with teaching fire safety regulations to architecture students, a very important subject indeed. However, it needs a focus and a rigorous research approach. The author needed to state a clear research question or identify a knowledge gap that needed to be addressed. As a result, the contribution of the article needs to be clarified.

The literature review is somewhat missing; it was unclear what theoretical gaps were identified and what studies have already dealt with the challenge. Typing "Fire safety in architectural education" resulted in 218,000 results, showing a lot of research activities in that area that were not covered. As a result, the article lacks references to previous works, and many arguments were left unsupported (e.g., "There may be teaching on fire, but is incidental in the architectural design courses").

The "pedagogical techniques" of the course do not clearly align with the L.O. stated, and the methodology to study their effectiveness was based solely on questionnaires. Although I believe in the power of good questionnaires to provide evidence for students' learning experiences, I do not think this can be used alone as a dataset for evaluating the effectiveness of a new pedagogy. It was unclear how the questions aligned with pedagogical issues, how the "pedagogical techniques" aligned with L.O., and how the analysis method aligned with both.

I also think that the structure of the article could be improved. It is advisable to merge the "need for the study," "the aim of the study," and "about the National Building Code 2018" into the introduction and add a paragraph that states the contribution that the article provides to the theory. And/or pedagogy and/or research methodology.

In conclusion, I don't think the author provides sufficient evidence for his arguments based on previous studies in the field or their own study.