



**Paper: “Strengthening Pandemic Preparedness in Undergraduate Education through Curricular Reform: Post-COVID-19 Insights”**

**Submitted: 23 June 2025**

**Accepted: 06 August 2025**

**Published: 31 August 2025**

Corresponding Author: Dea Goderdzishvili

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n24p1

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Elton Chavura

University of Livingstonia, Department of Public Health, Malawi

Reviewer 2: Aelita Bredelyte

Klaipeda University, Lithuania

-----  
Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

Adequate, concise

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The entire abstract should be written as a single paragraph. Describe how respondents were identified and recruited into the study. Include ethics approval number as you were dealing with human subjects. Can you mention in full MAXQDA in your abstract as it is not encouraged to use highly technical terminologies in this section. The aim of the study was to identify key indicators for strengthening pandemic preparedness. Where are they in your findings and conclusion? Are they the same as the core areas for reform? If yes, can you please stay consistent with your wording to avoid confusion? Check your key words. They seem to be off track. eg. Georgia, qualitative research, health science, and yet you frequently mention covid 19, pandemic preparedness, curricular reforms. Is there any specific reason why you seem to be avoiding the use of recurring words in this section?

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

No grammatical errors, if any they are negligible.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

Define the extent to which curricular in high income countries helped to control covid 19 which was not the case with LMICs? Most high income countries in Europe or beyond witnessed the worst devastating impact of covid 19 even far more than the impact in LMICs. I want you to clearly justify this point as it can form the basis of your argument and problem statement. Explore how curricular readiness can be measured. Explore further literature here in your revisions. Tell us the research gap. What have other researchers done before. Where is the novelty in this research?

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

Fairly done

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion should effectively summarize the study's key findings, restate the thesis, and highlight the significance of the research, while also acknowledging any limitations and suggesting future research directions. It should not introduce new information, but rather synthesize and reflect on the evidence and arguments presented in the body of the paper. Can you rewrite this section please?

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Fairly done

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

It is generally a very important area of study and quite relevant in the field of Public health. Author(s) need to do some revisions to refine the article. I have submitted my comprehensive comments using track changes. I wish you good luck as you revise and refine your work.

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Accept Submission

-----  
**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is appropriate, well-formulated, and aligned with both the scope and content of the article.

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

The abstract clearly presents the objectives, methods, and results.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The study methods are explained clearly and thoroughly.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

- The structure and flow of the manuscript are logical and coherent.
- The academic language is appropriate, and most sections are free from major grammatical errors.
- There is consistent terminology throughout the paper.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The Conclusion is clear, accurate, and well-supported by the body of the paper. It effectively summarizes findings, reflects the study's purpose, and offers meaningful implications for research and practice. However, minor corrections are suggested:

- Consider explicitly restating the practical implications (e.g., curriculum design recommendations, integration of simulations) for stronger impact.
- The term "resilient and adaptable healthcare workforce" is well used but could be supported by briefly reinforcing how the study contributes to this (e.g., training tools, student engagement strategies).

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Every reference listed does appear in the article body.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

5

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Dear Author,

Thank you for submitting your manuscript to the European Scientific Journal. Your paper presents a timely and important contribution to the field of health sciences education, particularly in the context of post-COVID-19 curriculum reform. Below are specific comments that may help improve the clarity, accuracy, and overall impact of your work

Strengths of the Manuscript:

- Relevance: The topic is highly relevant and addresses a pressing need for integrating pandemic preparedness into undergraduate education.
- Clarity of Purpose: The aim of the study is clearly stated and well-supported throughout the manuscript.
- Methodological rigor: The qualitative approach is appropriately chosen, and the methodological details are comprehensive and transparent.
- Thematic insight: The three thematic areas—institutional readiness, public health communication, and collaborative capacity—are well-developed and supported by rich participant data.
- Practical implications: The study offers actionable recommendations that can inform educational policy and curricular development in Georgia and similar contexts.

Areas for improvement:

- The manuscript is well-written overall; however, a few minor grammatical errors and typographical inconsistencies should be corrected (e.g., verb forms like “can be strengthen” → “can be strengthened”).
- Consider revising punctuation in complex lists and using em dashes (—) instead of hyphens (-) where appropriate.
- The conclusion is well-aligned with the study findings. You might consider more explicitly restating practical recommendations to emphasize the real-world applicability of the research.

This is a valuable and well-structured manuscript that offers meaningful insights into educational reform for pandemic preparedness. With minor revisions to language, the paper will be even more impactful and suitable for publication.

Best regards,

Reviewer

-----