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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | * This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides a brief understanding of the political economy of disasters in the geo-physical context of Nepal, a country highly vulnerable to natural calamities and hazards * By probing how socio-political structures, governance gaps and development patterns shape disaster vulnerability and response, the study contributes valuable insights into the intersection of risk, resilience and inequality * Its qualitative analysis offers a localized perspective that enriches global disaster research and supports the development of more inclusive and effective mitigation and recovery policies * Moreover, it emphasizes the need for integrated disaster management frameworks that prioritize equity and preparedness in hazard-prone regions. | Thanks for the comments and suggestions. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, "The Political Economy of Disasters: Experiences from Nepal," is broadly suitable as it captures the central theme of the manuscript — the intersection of disaster impacts and socio-political factors within the context of Nepal.  But the **alternative following titles** may be used. For example:  "From Hazard to Recovery: Understanding Nepal's Disaster Vulnerability through a Political Economy Lens"  "The Political Economy of Natural Disasters in Nepal: Governance, Risk, and Recovery" | The title is kept as it is. |
| 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. | **Clarify the Research Objective and Methodology:**   * While the abstract mentions a "qualitative descriptive analysis," it does not specify the methods used (e.g., interviews, document review, case studies) * Consider stating how the research was conducted and what specific earthquake is referred to ("the current earthquake disaster" is vague).   **Suggestion:**  "This study employs qualitative descriptive analysis, including interviews with affected populations and policy stakeholders, to examine the political economy of the 2015 Gorkha earthquake in Nepal"  "Although natural disasters do not discriminate against by class or group, evidence reveals that poor and marginalized communities suffer disproportionately and face prolonged challenges in recovery".  **Improve Logical Flow:**  The abstract jumps between ideas (hazards, urbanization, legislation, resilience, equity) without clear transitions. A more organized structure would be:   * 1. Problem statement   2. Context (Nepal’s vulnerability)   3. Methodology   4. Key findings   5. Conclusion/Implications   **Specify Key Findings and Contributions:**   * The abstract could more clearly state what the study contributes to existing secondary systematic literature review or policy. | The following comments have been addressed, and necessary changes were made and highlighted. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript appears scientifically sound in its overall intent and thematic approach, particularly in its effort to link disaster impacts in Nepal with broader socio-political and economic structures. However, there are several areas where scientific rigor and clarity could be improved to meet the expectations of academic and scientific audiences. | Certain terminologies are replaced with suggested synonyms as per the suggestions. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Based on the abstract alone, it is unlikely that the references are fully sufficient or up to date, particularly regarding recent literature (post-2020) and foundational theories in disaster risk.  **Recommendations:**   * Include references to foundational frameworks in disaster risk and vulnerability through considering Global and south Asian context (Bangladesh, India, Bhutan etc.) * Update the reference list with recent (last 5 years) peer-reviewed articles and policy documents, especially those dealing with Nepal’s post-earthquake recovery and climate vulnerability * Cite empirical studies that support key claims made in the abstract and body of the text. | Related references have been cited accordingly. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | * The key ideas are logically presented * The vocabulary used is appropriate for the subject matter * The conclusion effectively summarizes the purpose and key findings.   **Recommendations for Revision:**   1. Improve grammatical accuracy and sentence structure. 2. Use more precise academic language. For example:    * Instead of *“hurt by disaster,”* use *“disproportionately affected by disasters.”*    * Replace *“normal running of the natural life”* with *“normal functioning of society or community systems.”* 3. Add transitions to improve logical flow between sentences and ideas. | Necessary grammatical corrections have been made. |
| Optional/General comments | This manuscript addresses a critically important and timely topic—how political and economic structures shape disaster vulnerability and response, using Nepal as a case study. The focus on the socio-political dimensions of disaster risk adds valuable depth to the growing literature on disaster risk reduction, particularly for low-income and hazard-prone regions. | Thank you for the remarks.. |
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| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)* | No ethical consideration is mandatory. |