Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJESS_110459**
Title of the Manuscript:	**LAND ACQUISITION AUTHORITY DISPUTE MODEL: Case Study of the Construction of the Makassar – Parepare Railway in Pangkajene Regency and the Islands of South Sulawesi Province**
Type of the Article	**Review Article**

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	Yes, the manuscript appears to be important for the scientific community as it addresses a crucial issue related to land acquisition authority disputes in the context of infrastructure development. The research aims to contribute valuable insights into resolving disputes effectively, offering a model named the Effective SENADA Settlement Model. This research may provide valuable contributions and solutions for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers in the field. Yes, it effectively conveys the focus and scope of the research Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear and concise summary of the research, including the aim, methodology, key findings, and implications. Yes Yes Yes	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	I have checked the grammar and did the needful.	
Optional/General comments	Overall it is well explained.	

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:	**Laraib Javaid**
Department, University & Country	**The University of Agriculture, Pakistan**