

Reviewer Comments

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Behavioral Threat Assessment Programs in Preventing School-based Active Shooter Incidents

Comments to the editor:

Thank you for the opportunity to once again review “Evaluating the Effectiveness of Behavioral Threat Assessment Programs in Preventing School-based Active Shooter Incidents”, which was a comprehensive review of the effectiveness of BTAs. The article is much improved from its first version. I only have two comments remaining for the authors, neither of which require my additional review beyond this point. 1) I believe the three Jackson and Viljoen citations should be 2024a, 2024b, and 2024c rather than 2024, 2024a, and 2024b 2) I caution the authors to avoid making the paper sound like they collected their own data and rather than reviewing past research. Other than that, I have no additional comments.

Comments to the authors:

Thank you for the opportunity to once again review “Evaluating the Effectiveness of Behavioral Threat Assessment Programs in Preventing School-based Active Shooter Incidents”, which was a comprehensive review of the effectiveness of BTAs. The article is much improved from the first time I reviewed it. I greatly appreciate the authors removing redundancy, thereby shorting the paper by nearly half the pages, and also integrating in far more references. At this time, I only have two comments for the authors, one very minor and one slightly more substantive.

- 1) In the reference list, the authors list the three Jackson and Viljoen references as 2024, 2024a, and 2024b. I believe the correct way to do this is list them as 2024a, 2024b, and 2024c, as just having 2024 without a letter indicates no other citations by those authors in that specific year. It's a minor point, but helps clarify the reference list further.
- 2) More substantively, in restructuring and shortening the paper, the authors have inadvertently added content that I find fault with. They have included a methodology and findings and analysis section, both of which I approve of. However, the authors state that they use a mixed-methods approach to study the effectiveness of BTAs and note the quantitative and qualitative evidence they will be providing. However, *they* are not providing evidence. They are reviewing the work of others, which is totally fine, but those sections, as written, give the impression the authors collected the data themselves, which obviously they did not. I encourage the authors to revise these sections slightly just it clear they are doing a systematic review. They do this in the introduction to good effect, so they should do so again in the methodology section to make this clearer.

Beyond these points, I have no further feedback. Thank you!