

Reviewer Affiliation	BRIN
Manuscript ID:	DPM-08-2024-0209
Manuscript Type	Research Paper
Keyword	Trust, Disaster, Management, Community, media
Date Assigned:	16-Sep-2024
Date Review Returned:	10-Oct-2024

req 1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?

The research has an important discussion for the discourse on disaster prevention in Indonesia, especially in practical terms. However, the research still needs to be refined so that its contribution to science can be more visible.

req 2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?

Input for the introduction section: one of the main factors causing people to return to live in disaster-prone areas in Indonesia is that it is the only place left in a region for them to occupy. This is due to various reasons including limitations related to the economic capabilities of the community and existing spatial planning policies. Additionally, people may live in disaster-prone areas because they have professions that depend on their location. Please ensure that the complexity of this phenomenon is also discussed in the introduction to complement the discussion related to trust that causes people to reoccupy disaster-prone areas.

Input for the literature review section: The level of public trust in the government in Indonesia tends to be low due to existing justice issues. This research has illustrated this by discussing the problem of uneven/problematic distribution of post-disaster aid. However, justice/integrity issues related to government policies may be broader and also need to be discussed in the literature review section. One of them is spatial injustice, such as government spatial planning policies that tend to only accommodate the interests of the upper-middle class. In flood-prone riverbank areas, for example, the government can evict slum settlements while allowing apartments in the same location simultaneously. This injustice condition certainly affects public

trust in government policies.

It may be necessary to consider new research questions that, by answering them, can synthesize all existing findings.

req 3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?

To make the findings more convincing, triangulation of the obtained interview results may be conducted. Data such as photos from field observations or statistical data from BPS may be used as comparisons to clarify the interview results.

req 4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analysed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?

Findings can be enriched from other primary data or related secondary data.

req 5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper identify clearly any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?

The lack of references from previous research discussed in the analysis section makes it less clear how the research findings relate to existing research and how the research contributes to science. Try to include more references in the reference section so that how this research fills the research gap is more explicit.

req 6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.

The paper effectively communicates its case using appropriate technical language and jargon for the field of disaster management and trust studies. It maintains clarity and readability through well-structured sentences, clear definitions of key concepts, and logical organization. Acronyms are introduced with their full forms, and

examples from Semarang and Yogyakarta are used to illustrate points. Overall, the paper balances technical detail with accessibility, making it suitable for its intended academic audience.

Recommendation

Major Revision

Confidential Comments to the Editor-in-Chief

Comments to the Author

While the paper provides extensive theoretical information on trust and disaster management, some sections could better connect with practical applications in the field. For instance, how can these findings be directly applied by governments or NGOs in real disaster situations?

There are complaints about the lack of transparency in aid distribution and disaster budgets. The paper could delve deeper into how transparency can be improved and its impact on public trust.

Files attached

Do you want to get recognition for this review on <https://clarivate.com/products/scientific-and-academic-research/research-discovery-and-workflow-solutions/researcher-profiles/> Web of Science?

Yes