

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_122356</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Enablers and Consequences of Landslide Outbreaks in Bududa District, Eastern Uganda</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript is generally clear, well-structured, and logically progresses from one point to another. The discussion identifies key factors (both natural and anthropogenic) contributing to landslides, synthesizing findings with previous research. These terms are consistently applied in discussing the relationships between soil characteristics and landslides.</p> <p>The manuscript effectively ties the study's findings to previous research, particularly in emphasizing natural factors such as rainfall and soil properties as primary contributors to landslides. The acknowledgment of the exacerbating role of human activities aligns with widely accepted concepts in environmental science and geomorphology.</p> <p>The study integrates human activities into its analysis, recognizing their role in worsening natural landslide conditions. This approach is consistent with interdisciplinary perspectives on environmental hazards, which emphasize both physical and social dimensions.</p> <p>A unique point is raised regarding the potential benefits of resettlement, which adds nuance to the discussion. This observation acknowledges both the destructive and possibly restorative aspects of natural disasters.</p> <p>The study offers recommendations for mitigation strategies, including sustainable land use practices, community involvement, and engineering solutions. These suggestions are in line with current disaster risk reduction frameworks. The discussion also acknowledges the challenges, such as limited resources, which is crucial for practical application in resource-poor settings like Uganda.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p>Abstract is appropriate and comprehensive. Highlight of statistical parameters might not be necessary for the abstract as the text itself provides sufficient information.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, both structure and subsections are appropriate.</p>	
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>During the field and analytical work authors have utilised a combination of scientific and technical methods to define the main contributing factors for landslide occurrence in Bududa district.</p> <p>In terms of scientific approach, relevant methodology was used and specific conclusions drawn from the results. The study's findings are generally scientifically robust, with a solid grounding in the relationship between natural and human factors contributing to landslides. The distinction between human and natural factors is made, but the text could benefit from discussing the relative magnitudes or specific conditions under which each plays a dominant role.</p> <p>The positive outcomes of resettlement are noted as "amazing," but this language is somewhat subjective. More measured language, coupled with concrete data on how resettlement leads to improved conditions, would improve the scientific tone.</p> <p>Citations are appropriately used to back up claims and contextualize findings. This strengthens the scientific credibility of the discussion.</p> <p>From the technical point of view, all methods that were used are fully established in practice and establish relevant results to qualify the findings. The discussion is technically sound. The correct use of technical terminology and appropriate citations shows a solid foundation in environmental science.</p> <p>Some sentences could be more concise. For example, "The displacement of communities also leads to social and economic disruptions" could be streamlined. However, this does not hinder comprehension.</p>	

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, appropriately selected and utilized. No further suggestions.	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b>  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, language is appropriate and clearly passes both scholar and scientific message.	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>	A number of abbreviations are used in the manuscript without a clear explanation what they mean. It is recommended that the authors put the full meaning and abbreviation in brackets when first used, and then continue only with abbreviation. Section 2.5 ends with the uncompleted statement "The use of more". Completion or deletion is necessary. It is recommended to run a spell and grammar check as some of the words are misspelled, and sentences composition could be improved. Sentence composition is not crucial but could improve reading experience.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<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:	Igor Jokanović
Department, University & Country	University of Novi Sad, Serbia