

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1) As a review of how these technologies are being applied, it is possible, but it is limited to only two. It should focus on geographic information technologies since GPS, field data, thematic cartography, spatial analysis should also be included. Although it is mentioned in the summary that it is limited to these two, in the end there is no discussion as such, it also focuses on GIS and RS as if they were the same when they are not.</p> <p>2) No. The title mentions two technologies (GIS & RS) for the landslide disaster, but at the end they add a theoretical perspective, there is no theoretical perspective but an application review of the mentioned technologies for the landslide. I suggest changing the title.</p> <p>3) The abstract of the article is comprehensive, but the content is not what is expected when reading the article.</p> <p>4) Section 2 is too long in question form, subsections 2.1 to 2.4 can be formatted as a section by omitting 2.</p> <p>5) I think it can be improved to make it scientifically correct.</p> <p>6) Bello 2014, Merret 2013, Van Westen 2020 and Vyas 2007. are repeated. Bhavika 2009 is not in the same format. They are cited in the document Osuret et al 2011 and 2016, in the bibliography only 2016 appears. In the year, the month should be removed in the bibliography. Quotes that are misspelled for example: Singh Roy, 20Leon09</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes,	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	In the paragraph before section 2, they mention that with GIS and Remote Sensing they record data from large areas in the shortest time. It is necessary to clarify the GIS is the software with which you work while the remote sensing is the obtaining of data. There are parts of text in the document that read repetitive. That is, the idea of what you want to communicate is the same.	

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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Miguel Armando López Beltrán
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Sinaloa, México