

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_130063
Title of the Manuscript:	Post shallow-landslide habitat disturbance and vegetation recovery status in a wet montane wildlife sanctuary in the eastern highlands of Zimbabwe
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

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.	This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it highlights the critical connection between landslides and vegetation recovery. The insights it provides on vegetation dynamics following landslide events in specific areas are particularly intriguing. Understanding these interactions is crucial for developing effective strategies for ecosystem restoration and disaster management.	Noted done
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	If found the title is suitable	Noted done
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 abstract effectively addresses the background, methods, results, and conclusion of the study. Considering the scope of the research, the abstract is well-written and appropriate. But, need to be revised in line with revised manuscript after incorporation of comments.	Done
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	<p>To ensure the scientific accuracy of this manuscript, the following issues need to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) This paper aims to identify areas affected by tropical cyclone-induced shallow landslides and calculate the percentage of wildlife impacted by these landslides. It concludes that 10.3% of the area was affected. However, I could not find any explanation of the methods and procedures used to arrive at this result. My questions are: How was the total area of shallow landslides across the study area estimated? Thus, I would like to understand the methods you employed for this estimation, including any validation mechanisms.2) The discussion section of the manuscript lacks adequate support from the literature. For example, the topics "Vegetation Recovery Status (5.2)" and "Alien Plant Invasion Status at Affected Sites (5.4)" are not thoroughly supported or evaluated in comparison to other studies. Similarly, "Areas and Locations Affected by Shallow Landslides in the Study Area (5.1)" is addressed superficially and lacks sufficient relation to similar works.3) I noticed a weak connection between the results and discussion sections. For instance, figures that should have been clarified in the results section, such as Figures 5 and 6, are instead included in the discussion without any mention in the results. I recommend providing a proper description of these figures in the results section and citing them in the discussion only when necessary. The results should be presented well and then pave way for discussion.4) I would like to understand the scientific procedures used to derive the findings presented in result 4.2, specifically regarding "vegetation type, elevation, slope, and number of slides." Is it depending on simple counting that does not require scientific methods?5) Methodological shallowness should be avoided. The means of data collection vividly indicated only for taking soil sample and plant species. But, lacks information on shallow landslides and other interactions to be expected. Since the study area size is too small your methodology need to be sound enough to show the real exercise you made while undertaking this study.6) There should be the section that clearly states the gaps by using strong arguments in the introduction section before settings aims indicated in last paragraph.7) Avoid unnecessarily superscripted numbers.8) Properly indicate your maps, do not miss landslide from legend, & show some detail on photos for understanding either by highlighting or adding shapes for emphasis.	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The area was estimated using the formula outline in the manuscript after adding together estimated size of each landslide. Also addressed in the methodology.2. More literature now incorporated3. Addressed4. Use of field guides for vegetation type identification, GPS for elevation while simple counts to establish total number of shallow landslides.5. Noted6. Noted7. Noted and corrected.8. Noted. However, to avoid compressing the legend, the sites were marked outside.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<p>One of the major shortcomings of this manuscript is the use of references. The issues can be summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Insufficient References:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) The introduction lacks adequate referencing. For example, statements such as "Habitat and vegetation damage are major threats to the maintenance of ecological systems in protected areas and forests. Rapid vegetation recovery at shallow landslide sites is important for increasing land stability and retaining wildlife habitats" should be supported with evidence from relevant literature.b) The methodology section lacks sufficient literature support and is overly shallow.c) Similarly, the discussion section is inadequately supported by references.	Thank you for this. All reference have been updated and recent literature added except for those where there are no recent literature found.

Review Form 3

	<div>2. Obsolete Sources: Out of the 35 cited references, 13 (37%) are from works published before 2000, making them over 30 years old.</div> <div>3. Missed References: Among the 35 works cited in-text, 19 (54%) are not included in the reference list. Additionally, 9 references listed are not cited in-text.</div> <div>4. Inappropriate Referencing and In-text Citations: The references are incomplete, with instances of duplication and inconsistency in in-text citations. For example, "Asada and Minagawa, 2023" is inconsistently referred to as "Hiroshi Asada and Tomoko Minagawa, 2023."</div> <div>These issues undermine the scientific rigor and credibility of the manuscript, and addressing them is crucial for improvement.</div>	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Requires thorough edition	Thank you noted and language edition done
Optional/General comments	PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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)	No ethical issues