



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Awareness and Preparedness on Volcanic Eruption among Residents in the Danger Zone
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript demonstrates scholarly merit; however, revisions are required to enhance its clarity, coherence, and overall quality. The authors are requested to carefully review and address all comments provided by the reviewers and incorporate the necessary revisions accordingly. Furthermore, please ensure consistency between in-text citations and the references section. All cited works must be accurately listed in the references, and a thorough cross-check of all citations and references should be conducted to confirm completeness and accuracy.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
First of all, congratulations to the authors for conducting this very timely study. Looking into the volcanic awareness and preparedness in Camiguin is very critical since all the barangays in Mambajao are in danger zones. The topic is a good fit for the journal.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
1. There is a glaring contradiction in your methodology section. In the Abstract, it was written that a purposive sampling technique was utilized. However, in the Respondents of the Study section, you first stated that the convenience sampling technique was utilized. Then, just two sentences later, you mentioned again that a purposive sampling technique was used. Kindly fix this and be clear on what exact sampling method was really used. Also, please justify how you arrived at exactly 378 respondents. There is no mention of any formula or statistical power analysis used to compute this sample size.
2. The Introduction provides good background context about volcanic hazards globally and in the Philippines. But it lacks a solid theoretical foundation. For a rigorous scientific journal, you need to anchor your latent variables on an established theory (such as the Protection Motivation Theory or the Health Belief Model) to strongly guide the logic of your inquiry.
3. I am quite concerned with the logic used to explain the correlation. Your data successfully revealed a statistically significant and very strong positive correlation ($r = 0.812$) between awareness and preparedness. However, in the Conclusion, you stated that it does not require a high level of awareness to influence preparedness at a high level. This statement actually contradicts your statistical finding. A strong positive correlation implies that as awareness goes



up, preparedness also strongly goes up. Furthermore, your overall mean for awareness is 3.13 and for preparedness is 3.34. These values are numerically close on a 4-point scale. Please re-evaluate your narrative so it correctly aligns with how a positive correlation works.

4. The discussion is a bit too descriptive right now. For instance, the results showed significant differences across the explanatory variables, noting that newer residents demonstrated higher vigilance compared to long-term residents. While you cited authors to support this, I suggest you dig deeper into the why aspect. Why does this normalization of awareness happen specifically in the socio-cultural context of Camiguinons? Deepening the analysis will make the discussion much more robust, rather than just merely repeating the numbers from the ANOVA tables.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
This paper tackles an important and very relevant topic for Camiguin, and the study has practical value for local disaster planning. The dataset is also good in size, and the paper already shows a clear community-based direction. However, my main concern is the methodological consistency and rigor, because several parts of the methods and interpretation do not fully align with each other yet. This issue is major because it affects the strength of the conclusions, even if the topic and intention of the study are commendable.

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The manuscript says the study is descriptive-quantitative, but at the same time it says it is supplemented by qualitative data, with casual interviews and even focus group discussion used in developing the instrument. But in the results, the treatment is fully quantitative, and the qualitative part is not presented in a clear analytic way. Because of this, the design of the study becomes confusing. Also, the sampling section is not stable because it mentions both convenience sampling and purposive sampling, and this must be clarified since these are not the same and they have different implications for representativeness. In addition, the paper uses very strong interpretations from descriptive and correlational findings, such as explaining why some groups are more aware or more prepared, but these explanations already go beyond what the design can support. Related to this, the instrument development, validity, and reliability parts are still too general. For example, the paper mentions validated questionnaire and Cronbach alpha of 0.87, but it is not clear whether this value is for the whole tool only or for awareness and preparedness separately, and there is also no enough detail on content



validation process and construct basis of the items. I suggest the authors revise the Methods section more carefully and make it fully coherent: identify one exact research design, clarify one exact sampling strategy, explain the instrument development and validation in more concrete terms, and limit the interpretation of results only to what the design can really justify. Once this major part is strengthened, the paper can become much more convincing.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			