

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Environment &amp; Ecology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJEE_111453</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>LANDSLIDE DISASTER MITIGATION IN TOURISM AREA DEVELOPMENT IN BAKTIRAJA DISTRICT, HUMBANG HASUNDUTAN REGENCY, INDONESIA</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides valuable insights into landslide disaster mitigation in a critical area known for tourism. Understanding and addressing these challenges are crucial for sustainable development and safety.</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> The title is generally suitable but could be more impactful. Consider: "Strategies for Landslide Disaster Mitigation in Baktiraja's Tourism Zones, Humbang Hasundutan Regency, Indonesia."</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> The abstract provides a good overview but could be improved by briefly mentioning the methodology and key findings to give readers a clearer snapshot of the entire study.</li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> The overall structure is appropriate, but some sections could benefit from reorganization to improve flow. Ensure that each section logically leads into the next, especially between the methodology and results sections.</li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> The manuscript appears scientifically correct; however, ensure all claims are backed by appropriate references and that the methodology is robust and replicable.</li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent?</b> Add more recent studies to strengthen the literature review. Ensure all seminal works are cited, and consider including studies with opposing viewpoints for a more comprehensive review.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b> The language needs some improvements for clarity and academic tone. Consider having a native English speaker or professional editor review the manuscript to enhance readability.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Data Presentation:</b> Enhance data presentation with more charts and tables where applicable. Ensure each visual has a clear title and description.</li> <li><b>Methodology Detail:</b> Provide more detail in the methodology section to allow replication of the study.</li> <li><b>Results</b> The quality of all figures is currently suboptimal; they should ideally have a minimum resolution of 600 dpi to ensure clarity and detail.</li> <li><b>Implications and Recommendations:</b> Offer clearer practical implications and</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	recommendations based on the findings.	
--	--	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emad H. E. Yasin</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Geomatics and Civil Engineering, University of Sopron, Hungary</b>