

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_96359
Title of the Manuscript:	The use of Geographical Information System (GIS) and Remote Sensing (RS) technologies in generation of information used to mitigate risks from landslide disasters: A Theoretical Perspective
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/editorial-policy>

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. I think the manuscript is valuable but very inadequate. The article should be developed. 2. Title of the article is suitable. 3. I agree that the abstract is comprehensive. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate but not sufficient. 5. I agree that the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references sufficient according to APA7 and recent.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	I've added some suggestions to the review form.	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ibrahim Ethem Gurbuz
Department, University & Country	Atatürk University, Turkey