

Review of: "Recent Trends and Techniques in Landslide Hazard Assessment"

Khan Shahzada¹

¹ University of Engineering and Technology Peshawar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Dear Authors,

Thank you for submitting your paper, "Recent Trends and Techniques in Landslide Hazard Assessment," for consideration. I appreciate the time and effort you invested in this research.

However, after a thorough review, the paper requires significant improvements to meet the standards of the journal. The weaknesses found include:

Weaknesses:

1. **Disjointed writing / Lack of Coherence:** Unnecessary sentences were found that affect the clarity of the work. It becomes difficult to understand the aims of the work when using a disjointed writing approach. Discontinuity in the content was found due to the use of unnecessary phrases. Sentences that are used are not contributing to the main narratives of the sub-sections.
 1. Abstract: Line 4 - Line 5
 2. Introduction: Line 7 - Line 8
 3. Land Hazard Zonation: Line 2 – Line 4, Line 8 – Line 11, Line 15 – Line 16, Line 21 – Line 21, Line 24 – Line 25
 4. Land Hazard Assessment: Line 5 – Line 7, Line 9 – Line 12, Line 19 – Line 24
 5. GIS: Fig. 4 and its explanation in Line 6 – Line 7 is not narrating the aim of the title.
2. **Credibility Concerns:** Citation discrepancies/ Citation errors due to dummy citations (dummy citation [47], Citation [41], and Citation [43]) that do not correspond to any reference in the paper bibliography section were found in the "Land Hazard Assessment" subsection, which undermines the credibility of the research work.
3. **Absence of Quantitative Support / Lack of Technical Depth:** This paper lacks insufficient technical rigor. In research work, especially in scientific and technical fields, it's essential to support claims and arguments with robust technical content, such as:
 1. Mathematical models and equations & this paper has no models.
 2. Statistical analysis and data visualizations (graphs, charts, plots) & this paper lacks this point.
 3. Technical diagrams and schematics & this paper is not supported technically in this regard.
 4. Algorithms and computational methods, which this paper lacks severely.

4. Unstructured Manner of Three Approaches: I found three approaches for landslide hazard assessment under consideration in this specific paper. I found that this paper lacks the proper structure and presentation of three approaches. First, the introduction of landslide assessment techniques, followed by the GIS section, which could include recent models for landslide hazard assessment. Finally, the land hazard zonation approach could be presented as a natural culmination of the previous sections. But this paper lacks this structure for the mentioned three approaches.