

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Research Advances in Environment, Geography and Earth Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2295
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) for Landslide Hazard Analysis (LHA) in Kota Kinabalu area, Sabah, Malaysia
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

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>
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.	The title of this paper is interesting and suggests it could be valuable to the academic community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The first time I read the title led me to expect something discovered by the AHP approach. However, the authors did not connect the AHP results to the discussion in Section 3. Although Section 3 is titled "Results and Discussion," it reads more like a "Literature Review" section + some results from other kinds of empirical analyses, not the results discovered by the AHP.	
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.	The information presented in the abstract does not match the details provided in the paper. Specifically, I couldn't find any table or graph that shows the following results: "The results showed that geology (27% variance), geodynamic features (14% variance), slope conditions (26% variance), hydrology/hydrogeology (14% variance), types of land use (3% variance), and engineering characteristics of soils (8% variance), and rocks (8% variance)." Moreover, the abstract claims that "the newly developed method works satisfactorily and with high reliability." However, it's unclear what this developed method actually is. I couldn't identify any new model proposed by this study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The introduction is too brief and lacks a clear statement of the study's objective and overall context. It doesn't effectively guide readers to understand the significance of the study. Additionally, it fails to introduce AHP (Analytic Hierarchy Process) and explain why AHP is the appropriate tool for this research. The explanations of the AHP methodology in Sections 2.3 – 2.4 are of poor quality. There are no details provided about the experts involved (e.g., the number of experts and their qualifications). The calculation process should be presented in a step-by-step manner, starting from the pairwise comparison matrix provided by the experts. I have never encountered any studies using the AHP approach with such brief and insufficient explanations.	
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.	The explanation in Section 3 is detailed and informative. However, it does not appear to be based on the AHP methodology. Instead, it reads more like the outcome of some empirical analyses.	

[Review Form2](#)

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	OK	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	OK.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Panitas Sureeyatanapas
Department, University & Country	Khon Kaen University, Thailand