

Peer Review Report

Review Report on Crowd-sourced buildings data collection and remote training: new opportunities to engage students in seismic risk reduction

Perspective, Earth Sci. Syst. Soc.

Reviewer: Michelle Salmon

Submitted on: 21 Jun 2023

Article DOI: 10.3389/esss.2023.10088

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the findings and viewpoint reported.

This paper uses young citizen scientist to collect and evaluate building fragility data for earthquake risk assessments. They have been able to show both the value of the data that students collect and assess different ways of collecting the data that allows the project to be inclusive. The education value alone of this program should be commended, as it provides students (and in turn most likely their families) with an awareness of the risk around them.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

This paper does a fantastic job of showing that citizen science can really make a difference in the earthquake risk space. The study has value in educating the public about the risks of different building types and educating the next generation of engineers about the problems with existing buildings. It also provides valuable data for comprehensive risk assessments that can be used to help reduce the risks and to inform authorities about potential impacts of earthquakes.

It would have been interesting to see the students provided with a training set of data which had already been assessed by experts. This is a common method to assess the quality of results for each citizen allowing quality control of results. This is a tactic often utilised in citizen science projects a great example is Galaxy Zoo.

Q 3 Please comment on the reported results and data interpretation. If there are any objective errors or fundamental flaws, you should please detail your concerns.

I think that the results are very informative for a trial program and I hope to see this project continuing into the future.

Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

No.

Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

If the manuscript includes original data, are the applied methods accurate and comprehensively described?

Yes.

Are the statistical methods valid and correctly applied? (e.g. sample size, choice of test)

Yes.

Are the data underlying the study available in either the article, supplement, or deposited in a repository?
No.

Does the study adhere to ethical standards including ethics committee approval and consent procedure?
Yes.

Q 5 Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

While the English is sufficient quality I would like to make a few suggestions on edits that could be made to make the paper easier to read. I have attached a file showing where I would edit in the comments, please take them as suggestions.

Figures 1, 2 and 4 resolution should be improved. The text in these figures is a bit hard to read.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Q 6 Originality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 7 Rigor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 8 Significance to the field	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 9 Interest to a general audience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 10 Quality of the writing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Q 11 Overall quality of the study	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>