

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOGER_130302
Title of the Manuscript:	COMMUNITY PERCEPTION IN NUSANTARA CAPITAL'S PARTNER AREA: CULTURAL VILLAGE LUNG ANAI, LOA KULU, KUTAI KARTANEGARA DISTRICT, EAST KALIMANTAN, INDONESIA
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1. Importance of the Manuscript This manuscript provides a valuable contribution to the scientific community by analysing the community’s perception of coal mining activities and their socio-cultural, environmental, and economic impacts. The research is particularly relevant as it addresses sustainable mining practices and post-mining land utilization, which are globally significant topics. The findings offer practical recommendations for policymakers and mining companies to align their activities with community welfare and environmental conservation.	Thanks for the comments.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	2. Title of the Article The current title is suitable, but for improved clarity and conciseness, I suggest the following revision: "Community Perception of Post-Mining Land Use: A Case Study in Lung Anai Cultural Village, East Kalimantan, Indonesia."	Thanks for the comments.
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.	3. Abstract Strengths: The abstract provides a comprehensive summary of the research objectives, methods, findings, and implications. Suggestions for Improvement: 1. Emphasize specific recommendations for policy and practical implementation. 2. Condense the background information to focus more on key findings and their significance.	Thanks for the comments.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	4. Scientific Robustness Strengths: 1. The mixed-method approach and sampling procedure are well-detailed. 2. The manuscript effectively combines quantitative and qualitative analyses supported by relevant literature. Suggestions for Improvement: Include additional visual aids (e.g., charts or graphs) to enhance the presentation of quantitative findings. Provide actionable recommendations based on the findings to strengthen the practical implications of the study.	Thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	5. References Assessment: The references are generally sufficient and relevant but include several dated sources. Suggestions: 1. Add more recent references (2022-2024) to ensure the research remains current. 2. Incorporate global case studies on post-mining land reclamation for comparative analysis. 3. Ensure uniform formatting of citations and references.	Noted

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	6. Language and English Quality The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication but requires minor grammatical refinements. Example: Replace “The hope of the people of Lung Anai Village for post-mining land can still be used by the community while maintaining its sustainability” with “The residents of Lung Anai Village hope for sustainable and beneficial post-mining land use.”	Ok
Optional/General comments	7. The manuscript aligns with the journal’s focus and offers valuable insights into the socio-environmental dynamics of coal mining activities. Minor revisions are required to improve clarity, focus, and presentation No competing interest issues were identified. There are no apparent ethical issues in the manuscript. Ensure all cited works are properly credited to avoid plagiarism concerns. No evidence of plagiarism was detected.	Thanks for the 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	