



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	The Language of Disaster: A Scoping Review of Framing Strategies in News and Social Media Communication
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

General Comments and Recommendations

The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

General Comments and Recommendations

The manuscript deals with an important topic because disaster communication strongly affects how people understand risk and act during emergencies. The paper has potential, especially in linking linguistic framing with news and social media communication. However, the present version has serious methodological and reporting weaknesses, especially in the study selection process, consistency of included studies, and evidence mapping. These issues need to be corrected before the findings can be considered reliable.

Specific Comments and Recommendations

The number of included studies is inconsistent across the manuscript. The abstract states that 26 studies were included, one part of the results says only 26 studies were finally selected, but another part says 40 studies met all eligibility criteria. The PRISMA diagram also does not clearly support the final number. This is a major issue because the whole synthesis depends on the exact corpus of studies reviewed.



The search strategy is not yet sufficiently reproducible. The manuscript mentions Google Scholar and ScienceDirect and gives some search terms, but it does not clearly state the exact search strings used per database, date of search, filters applied, number of pages screened in Google Scholar, and how records were exported. Without these details, another researcher cannot repeat or verify the review process.

The results section sometimes reads like discussion, and the discussion repeats many results. The results should focus more on mapped evidence, such as clear counts, categories, and patterns from the included studies. The discussion should then explain what these patterns mean for disaster communication, framing theory, and future research.

Some references and cited studies appear incomplete or unclear, including items with missing publication details, n.d. entries, and future-year publications. Since the review depends on the credibility of the included studies, all references must be carefully checked and completed. The author should also confirm whether all included works are peer-reviewed and eligible based on the stated criteria.

The limitations section needs to be more formal and more precise. Statements such as the review being “not perfect” or having “too few for a good scoping review” weaken the presentation. It would be better to explain the actual methodological limits, such as database coverage, English-language restriction, possible missed studies, and lack of quality appraisal if this was not performed.

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>
The topic of disaster communication is highly relevant today, and mapping the linguistic framing across different media platforms from 2005 to 2026 is a very good initiative. You did a great job combining theories from communication and linguistics. However, while I find your overall direction very promising, I have to be honest and say there are some heavy critical issues you must fix.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
Abstract and Rationale Your abstract is clear and successfully states that you synthesized 26 peer-reviewed studies. In the rationale section, using the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction to define disaster gives your paper a solid global context. You apply framing theory using Entman (1993) and Scheufele (1999). This is very classical and strong, but I suggest you also add one or two recent theories from the 2020s to show that your theoretical lens is updated.
Methodology and Search Strategy



Combining the Arksey and O'Malley framework with JBI and PRISMA-ScR is a very excellent methodological choice for a scoping review. I have a huge concern about your Boolean search string in Section 2.3. You placed the AND operator between your news media terms and social media terms. In search logic, this strictly requires every single paper to discuss BOTH news media and social media at the same time. This is probably why you only retrieved 137 initial records. If you want papers that discuss either news media or social media, you must change this logic.

Fatal Flaw in Study Selection Results

I looked at your numbers closely and there is a very big confusion in the manuscript. In the Abstract part, it is clearly stated that there are 26 included studies. Then, when reading the first paragraph of Section 4.1, it also mentions exactly 26 studies. However, it gets very surprising because in the third paragraph of that same Section 4.1, the number suddenly changes and states there are 40 studies. You really need to check and fix this inconsistency. You also explained that 51 studies were selected for full-text assessment, and 11 were excluded, leaving 40 studies that met the eligibility criteria. But in the very same section, you said only 26 studies were found to be included. You must mathematically correct this. Re-count your actual included studies and make sure the abstract, the text, and your PRISMA diagram all show the exact same final number.

Results and Synthesis

Table 2 is a very effective visual to show the distribution of disciplines, highlighting that Disaster Management covers 38.5% of the studies. Your synthesis in Section 4.3.1 is well-written. I agree with your finding that disaster communication heavily uses urgent, directive, and action-oriented language. Pointing out the lack of research on technological or man-made disasters is a brilliant observation and a very strong research gap. Your finding that English-language datasets dominate the literature is another excellent point. This truly marginalizes non-English speaking populations, and bringing attention to this makes your review valuable.

Limitations and Conclusion

In Section 5.3, you wrote that the scoping review is basically not perfect and that the small number of studies is due to human and time limitations in reading plenty of studies. I strongly advise you to delete this sentence. It sounds very unprofessional. All research has limitations, but you should frame them scientifically, such as database access limits, not because you did not have enough time to read. Your conclusion summarizes the text-centric bias in current research perfectly, suggesting a need for multimodal visual and audiovisual analysis in the future. Your declaration of using Grammarly and Quillbot for grammar checking is very transparent and ethical. I appreciate this honesty.

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</u> 1	<u>Reviewer</u> 2
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.			