

Review of: "Airbase Compatibility with Spatial Planning: A Case Study of Airbase Waterkloof (South Africa)"

Ramesh P S

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall, it is a well-researched paper with quality content. Minor restructuring of the paper and making it more concise will make it even better.

The abstract is not very clear, please consider rework on the abstract to include a summary of content, evaluation conclusions and possible limitations. The purpose of the paper should be clearly stated without any ambiguity. A summary of the methodology adopted for the investigation of spatial footprints generated by noise emission and aviation safety should be part of the abstract. The key findings should be presented in a clear and concise manner. The practical implications of the paper should be part of the abstract.

Since there are many abbreviations, please consider listing it out, perhaps before the introduction.

The historical background description of Airbase Waterkloof should be more concise and relevant to the topic. Similarly, sections 2, 3, and 4 need to be briefer, keeping in mind the knowledge level of the informed readers. Scrutinise the contents of these sections, stick to what is relevant to the topic, and delete repetitive statements implying the same meaning.

Sections 6 covers several irrelevant details. For example, the paragraphs starting with 'As far back as the 1970s' and 'With the demise of apartheid in 1994' should not be more than two to three sentences each.

It is recommended to include a **Findings Section**, which will give more clarity to the readers and improve the structure of the paper. The synthesis should flow from the findings.

The conclusion section is very lengthy, and it should be reduced to half, covering only the most significant aspects of the study. Limitations of the study and future research recommendations can be considered for inclusion as part of the conclusion.