

Review of: "How Effective are Tabletop Role-Playing (Serious) Games in Understanding and Validating the Predictive Capabilities of Disaster Response Agent-based Models?"

Mohammad Khorrami¹

¹ Islamic Azad University, Tehran Science & Research Branch

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Greetings,

The current manuscript is very attractive and useful and can be published after correcting the following comments.

The best

Title:

-The title you've proposed is well-structured and comprehensive for a scientific article. In my opinion, the title is quite long, which might make it less impactful at first glance. The parenthetical "(Serious)" might be integrated more smoothly. However, your original title is also suitable for publication. The choice between the two would depend on the specific focus of your research and the preferences of your target journal.

Abstract:

-The study's sample size ($n = 8$) is exceedingly small, especially considering the complexity of disaster response scenarios and the variability in participant backgrounds (medical doctors and master's students). This raises concerns about the generalizability and reliability of the findings.

Literature Review:

-A more critical statement of the literature seems to strengthen the rationale for using TRPG to validate ABM in disaster response.

- While the review cites several studies, there is a lack of synthesis or integration of these studies to create a coherent argument for the study approach.

Materials and Methods:

Research Methodology: DRTRPG Design and Implementation:

- It is necessary to state the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the study.
- State the ethical considerations of the present study.

Concepts, principles, and experimental setup:

- Move and delete the first two and a half lines of the "Concepts, principles, and experimental setup" section to the introduction or literature review sections.

Results and Discussion:**Results**

- It might be better to move the first paragraph of the "Results" section to the "Participants" section.

Pre, post, and observer performance evaluation

- At the end of the "Pre, post, and observer performance evaluation" section, the researchers have presented a research proposal. It is better to transfer this proposal to the "Limitations and Future Study" section.

Discussion

- The discussion should provide more insights into why these discrepancies might occur and what they signify for the validity and application of the ABMS model.
- The section acknowledges significant differences between the results of the ABMS model and the DRTRPG but does not thoroughly explore the potential reasons behind these discrepancies. It fails to critically evaluate the limitations of using a DRTRPG as a validation tool for ABMS models, such as sample size differences, participant biases, or simulation simplifications.
- This section acknowledges the significant differences between ABMS and DRTRPG model results, but does not fully explore the potential reasons behind these differences (such as differences in sample size, participant sociocultural or geographic biases, or simulation simplifications).
- Researchers should clarify the generalizability of study findings.