

Review Form 3

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

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

Compulsory 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>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it offers a comprehensive analysis of landslide dynamics in Bududa District, integrating both natural and human factors. By examining the interplay between soil properties, climatic conditions, and human activities, the study provides valuable insights into the multifaceted causes and impacts of landslides. Its evaluation of various interventions contributes to the broader discourse on disaster risk reduction and management.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is too lengthy. For instance, instead of providing detailed mean response scores (MRS) and p-values, summarize the major findings in a more general way. Additionally, the abstract should include brief recommendations for stakeholders or policy implications based on the study's findings.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Overall, subsections and structure are appropriate. However, could I can have some questions as follows?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the last sentence of 2.4.1: However, of the total 212 sample, 180 provided responses that were utilized for data analysis and this gave a response rate of 84.9%. Could you clarify who these 180 respondents are, as this is relevant to the data analysis in section 3.0 results? In the data tables, you analyzed with N=60, while you initially surveyed 120 households. Why were the remaining households not included in the analysis? 2. In the last sentence of 2.5, you wrote "The use of more". Please complete this sentence. 3. In section 3.1, you should provide a bit more explanation, as the current interpretation is too brief. 4. In Table 2, what do you mean by "Level of Experience"? Are the household heads farmers, or does it refer to households in general, which could include both agricultural and non-agricultural households? If all of them are involved in agriculture, then the sample size part should be noted as "Farm household". 5. In Table 3, we can see that the enablers for three types of landslides (Falls, Flows, Slides) are relatively similar, while they differ for the remaining landslide type, Topples. This information could be useful for suggesting targeted mitigation and prevention measures for landslides 6. In Table 5, you wrote Strongly Disagree (SD), 2 = Disagree (A), 3 = Not Sure (NS), 4 = Agree (A), 5 = Strongly Agree => 2 = Disagree (D), 5 = Strongly Agree (SA) 7. In part 3.4, although you have mentioned the extent of utilization of interventions to mitigate the impact of landslides, you have not yet provided information on the effectiveness of these interventions. If the authors could include this information, along with details on the enablers of different types of landslides, it would provide a practical basis for proposing more feasible interventions in the local context. 8. In part 5, the authors need to summarize the key findings from the study and provide specific recommendations for policies and actions aimed at reducing the risk of landslides and improving the living conditions of the community. 	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The integration of both qualitative and quantitative data, including key informant interviews, soil sample analysis, and observational surveys, provides a well-rounded and thorough examination of the issue. The clear identification of key drivers and consequences of landslides, supported by relevant literature, further solidifies the scientific correctness of the study.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are sufficient and recent</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vu Thi My Hue
Department, University & Country	Vietnam