

Journal Name:	Asian Basic and Applied Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ABAARJ_1773
Title of the Manuscript:	Design Analysis Of Line 2 Avalanche Handling In Tenggarong, East Kalimantan, Indonesia
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides a significant understanding of avalanche handling in road infrastructure, a crucial area for ensuring transportation safety and economic mobility. The study emphasizes practical approaches such as slope stability analysis, retaining wall design, and field data collection, which are valuable for engineers and planners. I appreciate the detailed technical methods and real-world application focus. However, the manuscript could improve its clarity and technical depth in certain areas to enhance its impact.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it directly reflects the study's focus. However, a more precise title could be: "Design and Implementation of Line 2 Avalanche Handling for Road Safety in Tenggarong, East Kalimantan."	
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 provides a reasonable overview of the study but can be improved for clarity and completeness. Suggestions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include specific results, such as improvements in slope stability factors or cost implications. • Reduce redundancy in describing the methods and focus more on outcomes and significance. 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure are logical and appropriate, covering the introduction, methods, results, and discussion. However, including a dedicated "Limitations" or "Future Work" section would enhance comprehensiveness.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, as it is grounded in detailed field data collection and established engineering principles. The use of soil investigation results and stability analysis demonstrates a strong technical foundation. However, the sensitivity analysis of design parameters and their environmental implications could be elaborated for better depth.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are sufficient and include a mix of recent and foundational studies. However, incorporating more recent articles on slope stability and avalanche protection systems (e.g., from 2022–2023) could strengthen the context and relevance.	

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The language and grammar need polishing to improve readability and scholarly quality.• Figures and tables should have detailed captions for standalone understanding.• Avoid overly technical jargon in sections meant for broader audiences, such as the abstract or introduction.	
Optional/General comments	This manuscript addresses an important topic in civil engineering and provides practical insights into avalanche handling in road design. Refining the language, improving the abstract, and elaborating on certain technical aspects would make it more impactful and accessible to the scientific community.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arijit Kumar Banerji
Department, University & Country	Dr. B. C. Roy Engineering College, India