

Review of: "Recent Trends and Techniques in Landslide Hazard Assessment"

Alireza Sharifi¹

¹ Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

It is a great honor to be able to review this manuscript. I have carefully read this manuscript, and the overall layout is reasonable. The completion level of the manuscript is also relatively high, and the research ideas and result analysis have reference value. The overall quality of the manuscript has basically met the requirements for publication. However, there are still some flaws in the manuscript, which lead to many loopholes in the details of the manuscript as follows:

1. Abstract should be rewritten, and some important numerical findings should be provided.
2. The number of keywords in the manuscript is too small to fully cover the main research content of the article.
3. The authors should clearly state the objectives of the study, including the specific goals of the proposed method and the analysis of the model's performance. This will help readers understand the purpose of the research.
4. A deep literature review should be given, particularly regarding state-of-the-art models. Therefore, the reviewer strongly suggests discussing and analyzing some advanced and latest works:

10.1007/s12524-014-0423-3

10.1002/jsfa.10568

10.3390/agriculture12010118

10.1007/s12524-019-01057-8

10.1109/JSTARS.2023.3239756

10.1109/JSTARS.2023.3242310

5. Authors should provide the reasons for choosing the proposed algorithm.
6. What special information do you want to convey through Table I?
7. The setting of the current experimental results section is somewhat unreasonable. The algorithms involved in the comparison in the current manuscript are all basic algorithms, and the comparison between the author's research results and them is not significant. It is recommended that the author include the latest research results in the comparison, so as to analyze the differences with the current latest results.
8. What have been the limitations of your work?
9. The conclusion is still too long. Particularly, the latest statements must be shortened or eliminated.