

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_110343
Title of the Manuscript:	The Geohazard as Land Subsidence; in Anthropocene, India
Type of the Article	Research articles

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manuscript is vital for the scientific community, addressing land subsidence in India, offering valuable insights for researchers and policymakers. 2. Yes 3. Abstract is well-crafted, summarizing key objectives, methods, and findings clearly. 4. Manuscript structure is logically organized, contributing to overall clarity. 5. Manuscript appears scientifically correct, but a detailed peer-review is recommended for rigor. 6. References are generally sufficient and recent; additional sources suggested for a more comprehensive literature review. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the language and English quality of the article seem suitable for scholarly communications. The text is coherent, and the terminology used appears appropriate for academic discourse. However, a thorough language review during the peer-review process is advisable to ensure precision and clarity. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>a further peer review process is recommended to ensure accuracy and clarity.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Adi Prabowo
Department, University & Country	Indonesia