

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2857
Title of the Manuscript:	CULTURAL HERITAGE EDUCATION AS A TOOL FOR RESILIENCE: THE CITY AND ITS ALPHABETS
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the often-overlooked role of cultural and educational frameworks in post-disaster recovery. By focusing on the case of L'Aquila, it provides a unique perspective on how heritage and collective memory can contribute to rebuilding both physical and social structures after a disaster. I appreciate the manuscript for its interdisciplinary approach, blending insights from urban planning, education, and cultural studies. This makes it a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners involved in disaster recovery, heritage preservation, and community resilience.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Cultural Heritage Education as a Tool for Resilience: The City and Its Alphabets," is generally suitable as it encapsulates the core themes of the manuscript, emphasizing the role of education and cultural heritage in fostering resilience. However, to make it clearer and more specific to the case study and broader audience, a slight modification could be suggested: "Cultural Heritage Education for Post-Disaster Resilience: Lessons from L'Aquila's Recovery" This revised title highlights both the focus on education and resilience and references the specific case study of L'Aquila, making it more targeted.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a general overview, but it could be enhanced by including more specific details about the methodology and the key findings or arguments of the paper. Including these elements would give readers a better understanding of the paper's structure and main contributions.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured with clear sections addressing the impact of the earthquake and the role of heritage in rebuilding L'Aquila. However, it might benefit from a section explicitly dedicated to the methodology (if applicable) or a more structured conclusion summarizing the findings and their implications for urban and educational policy.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically sound as it combines historical analysis, educational theory, and cultural studies to address the post-disaster reconstruction of L'Aquila. It is grounded in relevant theoretical frameworks, such as the significance of cultural heritage and collective memory in community resilience. The integration of case studies with theoretical discussion strengthens its scientific validity. However, including some empirical data or examples from other cities for comparison could further enhance its robustness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references cited are relevant to the topic and well-selected from a variety of fields including cultural heritage, disaster recovery, and education. However, some sources are slightly dated. It may be helpful to include more recent studies (from the last five years) to reflect ongoing debates and advances in disaster recovery and heritage preservation.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are a few places where the phrasing could be refined for clarity and flow. Some sentences are complex and could be simplified to improve readability.	
Optional/General comments	While the manuscript presents important content, it requires improvement in terms of structure, language clarity, and some scientific robustness to meet the standards for publication. There do not appear to be any ethical issues in this manuscript, as it discusses cultural heritage education and resilience in the context of post-disaster recovery. No sensitive data or ethical concerns seem relevant to this type of research.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abir Ornob
Department, University & Country	Rajshahi University of Engineering & Technology, Bangladesh