

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Research Advances in Environment, Geography and Earth Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2294
Title of the Manuscript:	Debris flow susceptibility analysis using a bivariate statistical analysis in the Panataran River, Kg Melangkap, Sabah, Malaysia
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**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>
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.	This manuscript is significant as it enhances understanding of debris flow susceptibility in vulnerable regions. Using a bivariate statistical analysis, it offers a robust framework applicable globally. The findings inform local hazard mitigation and advance landslide risk assessment, making it a valuable resource for geoscience researchers and environmental planners.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes indeed.	

**Review Form2**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Abstract: The abstract is clear but could benefit from a more concise presentation on the methodology and its key findings. Consider revise for better flow.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction could be improved by clearly stating the gap in the literature that this study addresses. Please revise.</p> <p>Methodology: This section is detailed, but a clearer explanation on the statistical models would better clarify the approach. Please extend the explanation for statistical model part.</p> <p>Discussion: Please extend discussion on comparison of the study's results with those from similar studies in other regions. This would contextualize the findings and highlight the study's contributions. Consider revise</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Lim Eng Aik</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia</b></p>