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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **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 is significant for the scientific community as it provides a detailed case study on addressing the environmental challenges of over-tourism in Vigan City while promoting sustainable urban development. It highlights the innovative adaptation of indigenous architectural designs to incorporate sustainable features, offering insights into balancing cultural preservation with modern environmental needs. The integration of renewable energy and green infrastructure aligns with UN SDG 11, serving as a model for other heritage cities striving for sustainability. Additionally, the emphasis on green economics and accounting contributes valuable methodologies for assessing and implementing sustainable urban policies globally.** | The paper is well-rounded, tapping not only on the economic and technological aspects but also on socio-cultural and environmental aspects. This indeed aims to contribute to the achievement of SDG 11. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **OK** | The title shows an idea of the culture-basedand and science-based approach of the paper. |
| 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. | **Abstract has a few shortcomings:**   1. **Lack of specificity** 2. **Methodology is not defined clearly** 3. **Limited scope clarity** 4. **Challenges and Risks not mentioned** | The summary effectively and accessibly outlines the core issue, making it understandable even for those without specialized knowledge, as commented by other peer reviewers.   The specificity of the paper would depend on the adoption of the implementer; the sole purpose of the paper is to provide an approach that is holistic and ideal for the attainment of SDG 11. Further, it is important to know that the examples on each of the three parts are already specific in its way. The methodology is not defined clearly because it is not an actual research but rather crafting an approach to a policy. The scope is defined only to be implemented in Vigan Ilocos Sur. The scope is already mentioned in the category of proposed solutions. A challenge and how to solve that risk through this paper is already mentioned in the paper. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | **Plausible but requires empirical data, clear metrics, and references to established frameworks to ensure scientific importance. Like:**   1. **It lacks empirical evidence, like the manuscript lacks detailed quantitative data on environmental degradation (e.g., carbon emissions, pollution levels) or specific outcomes of proposed initiatives.** 2. **There is some methodological clarity: concepts like "Green Economics" and "Sustainability Accounting" reference valid frameworks, but their application in Vigan is not detailed, limiting the assessment of practical implementation.** 3. **The paper also lacks a risk assessment, with minimal discussion of potential challenges (e.g., funding, community resistance, or climate change impacts beyond sea-level rise), which weakens the scientific importance of the proposed solutions.** | There are already other academic and scientific references added to this. |
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| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | **OK** | The language is clear and easy to understand. |
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