

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	An Overview of Literature, Language and Education Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2858
Title of the Manuscript:	Countering Alphabetic Risk in Post-Catastrophic Contexts: The Role of Cultural and Environmental Heritage
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 paper highlights the importance of cultural heritage, education, and community identity after significant disasters. It reminds us that resilience isn't just about recovering; it is about creating something new using pieces from the past.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable.	
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.	<p>The abstract does well in identifying the key components: the research focus (teachers after an earthquake), methodology (semi-structured interviews), and results (the role of cultural heritage in recovery). You mention environmental heritage but focus primarily on cultural heritage in the rest of the abstract. Clarifying or elaborating on the role of environmental heritage, if it's central to the study, would be helpful.</p> <p>Some sentences are complex and could be simplified for ease of understanding. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Cultural heritage possesses vital ganglia..." could be simplified to "Cultural heritage plays a key role..." "Existential disorientation" might be clearer as "emotional confusion" or "loss of direction." <p>The abstract could benefit from more specific findings or examples. For instance, what particular strategies did teachers use, or what specific aspects of heritage were most helpful in the recovery process?</p> <p>The phrase "help people redefine the cultural, social, perceptual, and inhabited space" seems repetitive with the later mention of "help teachers and students to rebuild their personal, social and cultural community identity." You could merge or simplify these ideas for clarity.</p> <p>A brief mention of the broader implications of the study—such as its applicability to other disaster contexts—would enhance its relevance to a wider audience.</p> <p>Consider summarising any challenges or limitations of the study briefly.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its systematic analysis of literature, which provides a solid theoretical foundation for the study. Semi-structured interviews allow for in-depth exploration of the participants' experiences, ensuring that the data collected is rich and contextually relevant. Furthermore, the involvement of 23 primary school teachers who directly experienced a catastrophic event adds authenticity to the research, and the clear focus on the role of cultural and environmental heritage in post-disaster recovery is both timely and significant. The methodology and	

Review Form2

	interpretation of results appear coherent, making the study technically sound and well-structured.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient. However, there are few recent references. It would be good if you could use updates and recent references.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, as it follows a formal and academic tone, which is expected in research publications. However, there are instances where the language could be improved for clarity and precision. Some sentences are complex and may benefit from simplification to enhance readability. Additionally, certain terms like "vital ganglia" and "existential disorientation" could be rephrased to make the text more accessible to a broader scholarly audience without sacrificing depth. Overall, with minor revisions for clarity and conciseness, the language quality would meet the standards for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Renate Olga Shikwaya
Department, University & Country	University of Namibia, Namibia