

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Geological Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_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.	<p><b>1. Importance of the Manuscript</b>            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.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p><b>2. Title of the Article</b>            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."</p>	
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.	<p><b>3. Abstract</b>  <b>Strengths:</b> The abstract provides a comprehensive summary of the research objectives, methods, findings, and implications.  <b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emphasize specific recommendations for policy and practical implementation.</li> <li>2. Condense the background information to focus more on key findings and their significance.</li> </ol>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p><b>4. Scientific Robustness</b>  <b>Strengths:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The mixed-method approach and sampling procedure are well-detailed.</li> <li>2. The manuscript effectively combines quantitative and qualitative analyses supported by relevant literature.</li> </ol> <p><b>Suggestions for Improvement:</b>            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.</p>	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p><b>5. References</b>  <b>Assessment:</b> The references are generally sufficient and relevant but include several dated sources.  <b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add more recent references (2022-2024) to ensure the research remains current.</li> <li>2. Incorporate global case studies on post-mining land reclamation for comparative analysis.</li> <li>3. Ensure uniform formatting of citations and references.</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p><b>6. Language and English Quality</b>                  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.”</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>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</b></p> <p><b>No competing interest issues were identified.</b></p> <p><b>There are no apparent ethical issues in the manuscript. Ensure all cited works are properly credited to avoid plagiarism concerns.</b></p> <p><b>No evidence of plagiarism was detected.</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

	<p><b>Reviewer’s comment</b></p>	<p><b>Author’s comment</b> <i>(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)</i></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>Jonathan Teye</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Anhui University of Science and Technology, Ghana</b></p>