



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_37405
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Economic Viability of Engineering Structures As Landslide Protection Measures In Landslide Prone Zones
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	This Article addresses the landslide protection measures and the information related to the assessment of economic viability of engineering structures. The overall manuscript clear. But, firstly the authors must the paper according to the comments (below). Comments: - The abstract indicates the main results, but, the objectives and implications are missing. The abstract must gather other elements like the objectives, methods, implications... - The authors should keep the following rules: Each table and each figure have to be self-understandable. The reader should get a first impression of the relevance of a contribution only by studying the tables and figures, and without reading the paper sections (w, t & wo in figure 1-4 ???). - Please develop and discuss the experimental objectives; - There is no scientific discussion - Please, correct errors on: punctuation, some unclear sentences, - The conclusions must adequately tie together the other elements of the paper such as theory, and data, results... - References: several statements were copy-past from other works Example: the two first lines of the Material & Methods section were copy -past from the following reference: Morello, R., De Capua, C., Lugarà, M., Lamonaca, F., & Fabbiano, L. (2014). Risk model for landslide hazard assessment. IET Science, Measurement & Technology, 8(3), 129-134. - References have been prepared in a manner not consistent with the instructions for authors. For these reasons and in this state, I invite you to revise your manuscript	Benefits of the structures with (w) and without (wo) number of years (t) It shows the present value of the estimated benefits with maintenance exceeds the present value of the estimated benefits of all the structures without maintenance and has been shown in the figures 1, 2, 3 and 4. While surveying the study area and getting relevant information of the landslide mitigation measures, it was found that constructing the structures does play a main role in mitigating the landslides but lack of maintenance of the same reduces its effects in due course . Hence the benefit ratio of the structures were assessed with and without maintenance of the structures. Since this paper is part of my thesis work, exact references to this work was difficult to obtain so the most relevant references to this part of work has been included as such. All the corrections have been carried out as suggested.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		