

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

Monica Cardarilli<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> European Commission

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper is inconsistent and does not provide any scientific value. English grammar is very scarce, making reading and understanding very limited. Being proposed as a review, the paper neither lists nor describes the main/latest trends and techniques in landslide hazard assessment. Moreover, 'hazard', 'risk', and 'vulnerability' terms are misused or used improperly, highlighting a lack of understanding of their respective meaning and use in the scientific community. I would strongly recommend REJECTION of the paper.

To improve the overall quality of the paper, I would suggest the following:

- to have a look at published review papers, their structure, and development. It will facilitate the drafting, providing scientific value to the community working on landslide risk.
- to proofread the paper for better use of the English language.
- to have a consistent narrative that is in scope. Stick to the focal area without fragmenting it.
- to review the meaning of risk concepts and related definitions, being compliant with world-wide recognised terminologies.
- To avoid personal/subjective opinions: i.e., "obvious", "impossible." A review paper must be objective and to the point, based on scientific knowledge only.
- To shorten and review the sentences. They are too long and/or with several typos.