MANUSCRIPT EVALUATION FROM THE REVIEWER(s) TO AUTHOR

All fields are mandatory to be fulfilled by reviewer.
A. Evaluation objects:
1. Is the paper content original?
(YES)
2. Does the paper title represent its content?
(YES)
3. Does the abstract reflect the paper content?
(YES)
4. Do the keywords indicate the scope of the research?
(YES)
5. Is the research methodology or the approach of the problem solving clearly described?
(YES)
6. Do the data presentation and interpretation valid and reasonable?
(YES)
7. Do the use of tables and figures help to clarify the explanation?
(YES)
8. Have the discussion and/or analysis been relevant with the results of the study?
(YES)
9. Are the references used relevant?
(YES)
10. Contribution to science?
(GOOD)

```
11. Originality?
(GOOD)
12. Systematic?
(VERY GOOD)
13. Language?
(GOOD)
14. Writing accuracy?
(GOOD)
B. Reviewer's decision (PLEASE SELECT)
The paper:
       could be published with minor revision
Do you want your name, as reviewer, released to the author(s)?
(NO)
C. Comment about the paper
Reviewer 1:
       The whole manuscript should be between 4000 -7000 words.
       Answer: Thank you very much, we match our manuscript with the reviewer suggestion.
```

Reviewer 2:

My general comments for the paper entitled "Geological Approach for Land Subsidence Analysis in Peatlands in the Awareness Area of Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia" are as follow:

- I suggest to use the jpg of "hard copy" of geological for the measured location.

Answer: Thank you very much for this suggestion, we have already revised our quality for all of figures used in this manuscript.

- A field photograph of the data acquisition will add to the quality of the paper.

Answer: Thank you very much, we already conclude our clear research area map into

this manuscript.

- Adding GPS coordinates in each location will help the reader.

Answer: Thank you very much for this suggestion, we made changed all of our figures with the coordinate information.

D. Note from the editors

_