

Reviewer's comment-2

Yes. It tackles a real gap: how a defense-origin program (DoD AT) translates to open-access colleges with limited resources. The mixed-methods design and the DSISF contribution are useful to both campus safety practitioners and higher-ed researchers. With a few clarifications, it can inform policy and implementation.

Mostly. The title is clear and descriptive, but a bit long. Shortening it while keeping the focus on community colleges and the DoD Antiterrorism program would improve clarity.

- *Assessing the DoD Antiterrorism Program for Community College Security*
- *Adapting Defense Security Frameworks for U.S. Community Colleges*

Yes, the abstract covers context, purpose, methodology, findings, and implications. It could be more concise and focus less on background, highlighting the study's contribution and key results more directly. Trimming and simplifying would strengthen its clarity. 6–8 focused terms would also make it stronger and more effective for indexing.

Yes, overall the writing is clear and professional. Some sections are wordy and repeat similar points; tightening sentences and ensuring consistent use of terms (e.g., “DoD AT” instead of “DOD AT”) would improve readability and accuracy.

The structure follows academic conventions with clear chapters and subsections. The *Problem Statement* and *Significance* overlap and should be more distinct. The *Literature Review* is strong but could better separate sample data from national statistics. The *Methods* and *Results* sections are clear but should consistently use past tense and report full statistical details.

The manuscript includes solid references, but some in-text citations are missing from the reference list (e.g., Bowers & Hearn, 2022; Johnson & Lee, 2021). Updating with the most recent Clery Act and NCES reports, and ensuring full APA 7 formatting with DOIs or URLs, would improve rigor.

The manuscript acknowledges ethical considerations, including informed consent, confidentiality, and IRB approval, which shows awareness of research ethics. As long as those procedures were followed in practice, there are no major ethical concerns apparent.

Yes. Since parts of the manuscript appear to build on previously published work, it would be appropriate to include a disclaimer.

I declare that I have no competing interest as a reviewer.

Specific Comments:

This manuscript addresses an important and timely issue by evaluating the applicability of the DoD Antiterrorism program within U.S. community colleges using a well-structured mixed-methods design. The work makes a meaningful contribution by identifying the program's strengths and limitations and proposing the Dynamic Stakeholder-Integrated Security Framework (DSISF). However, few areas need minor revision: the *Problem Statement* and *Significance* sections should be more clearly differentiated, the abstract should be more concise and focused, and terminology and verb tense should be standardized throughout. Additionally, the reference list requires alignment with in-text citations and updating with recent authoritative sources. With these adjustments, the study will be significantly stronger and suitable for publication.