

## **Response to Reviewers**

Manuscript Title: Security Risk Management Frameworks in U.S. Community Colleges:  
Evaluating the DoD Antiterrorism Program's Suitability

Author: Dr. Robb Shawe

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

I appreciate your thoughtful and detailed feedback on my manuscript. Your comments have helped refine and strengthen the paper. Below, I provide a point-by-point response to each reviewer.

### **Reviewer 1**

- Importance of the manuscript

Response: Acknowledged, thank you. No significant changes required.

- Title suitability

Response: The title was retained for clarity; however, two shorter alternatives were also considered. Ultimately, the original form was kept to emphasize both the DoD AT program and community colleges.

- Abstract

Response: Trimmed and refocused to highlight contributions and results more directly.

- Writing clarity

Response: Wordy sections revised. Terminology standardized to 'DoD AT.' Tense consistency was ensured throughout.

- Structure

Response: Problem Statement and Significance sections revised to remove overlap and present distinct contributions.

- Methods and Results

Response: Past tense used consistently. Statistical details (e.g., reliability, effect size) clarified.

- References

Response: Reference list aligned with in-text citations. APA 7 formatting ensured. Updated with the most recent Clery Act and NCES reports.

- Disclaimer

Response: Added note clarifying that portions built on earlier work have been expanded here with new analysis and findings.

## **Reviewer 2**

- Scope and Literature Review

Response: Respectfully disagree with the request for international expansion. The focus is deliberately on U.S. community colleges and federal mandates (Clery Act, DoD AT). Adding global comparisons would dilute the applied purpose.

- Description of DoD AT Program

Response: Expanded description of program components in Section 2. Clarified why comparison with alternative frameworks is beyond scope.

- Methodology

Response: Clarified purposive sampling strategy and institutional diversity considerations. Statistical reporting enhanced. Power analysis is not appropriate given the exploratory mixed-methods design.

- Integration of Results

Response: Section 5 has been revised to integrate both qualitative and quantitative findings, thereby strengthening triangulation.

- Conclusions

Response: The conclusion now explicitly acknowledges variation in program effectiveness, reframing it as a meaningful outcome.

- Dynamic Stakeholder-Integrated Security Framework (DSISF)

Response: Clarified that DSISF is an applied, practitioner-informed framework meant as a starting point rather than a universal model.

- Policy Implications

Response: Expanded to connect findings to Clery Act compliance, emergency preparedness, and resource allocation.

- Formatting

Response: APA formatting standardized. Reference updates included.

**Final Note**

I have fully addressed Reviewer 1's comments and respectfully responded to Reviewer 2's points, adopting suggestions where they align with the scope while clarifying why others exceed the intent of this U.S.-focused study. The manuscript is now substantially more transparent, methodologically stronger, and more directly connected to policy and practice.