



EGUsphere, referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-1231-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-1231

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Brief Communication – ALARM: an innovative protocol of educating on seismic risk perception, and its assessment" by Maria Vittoria Gargiulo et al., EGU Sphere, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-1231-RC1>, 2022

First of all, thank you for submitting such a manuscript from the field of education. Risk perception is a very important issue and the manuscript does present a nice idea on how to foster it using GBL.

Nevertheless, there are a lot of blanks in the manuscript, which I think is partly due to the format chosen ("Brief Communication"). On the other hand, in my opinion, the work was also scientifically inadequate.

Here are my main points of concern:

- The abstract should be restructured to meet common standards (Background, Methods, Results, Conclusions). The results are missing completely.
-

A theoretical classification of the project is missing. The introduction is very general. It is not clear to what extent the project is a desideratum from previous research. Especially on GBL and Escape Rooms in tertiary education there is an incredible amount of literature. Questions arise such as: Why exactly is GBL resorted to, what advantages does the method offer in the chosen setting? Why, of all things, should GBL be used to learn about natural disasters? The Escape Room method is only defined in the practical part (from line 57), but entirely without sources. This paragraph is de facto a plagiarism.

- It is not made transparent at first what exactly the survey instrument looks like; this is only hinted at in the results (from line 144). The methods section (2.2) rather describes the basics of data analysis, for example, what a Likert scale is. This is out of place here. Does the quantitative part of the questionnaire really consist of only four items? If this is the case, all the statistical analyses presented are virtually "using a sledgehammer to

crack a nut", especially since the first question is highly suggestive. Calculating Cronbach's alpha makes little sense if it is not clear exactly which construct is being measured.

- The qualitative part is not theory-based. What type of qualitative content analysis was used?
- The discussion does not include a single source and thus does not place the results in any context of previous research. Terms such as "science capital" are named, but without concrete references and without sources.

There are minor errors throughout the paper (e.g. "key-role", l. 13), a spell check is required. The sources are not formatted consistently.

Overall, the paper unfortunately does not meet the usual standards of a scientific publication. The authors may consider addressing the points I mentioned and resubmitting the paper, possibly in a journal aimed at educators.