

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_90203
Title of the Manuscript:	Remote sensing and GIS aided Land and water resources management plan for a Kotni watershed, Chhattisgarh, India.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 1, line 7-8: These first two sentences have failed provide a background to the topic. Please, revise. It must capture the keyword of the title: GIS, RS, land, water and management. It should justify it is important to . 2. Page 1, line 9: Do you mean Fallow? 3. Page 1, line 14: Please remove, location coordinates and other details should be under study area section. 4. General comment on Abstract: Please, rewrite the abstract to capture <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background/introduction 2. Aim/objective 3. Methods 4. Results 5. Conclusion <p><u>You should clearly state the research problem in the background and state the theoretical and practical implications of your findings. You can also show this study can be replicated in other watersheds around the world.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Page 1, line 31: These references are too old. Please update, at least less than 5years old. This will tell the current state of the problem. Old refs are only reasonable in methodology e.g., previous models, approaches etc. 7. Page 2, line 32-33: These statistics must have changed between 2012 and 2022. Please update. 8. Page 2, line 34-37: You need a reference to back this results. 9. Page 2, line 44: You can't start a sentence with word such by while etc. please rewrite. 10. Page 2, line 49-53: The description of the study area is unacceptable for a Geography Journal. At least the description of the study area should contained <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Location 2. Climate 3. Drainage 4. Land use/Vegetation, and 5. How these factors may influence the study problem? Please revised. 11. Page 4, line 55: Please redraw the map in this format. Make the coordinates readable 12. Page 4, line 57: Data acquisition should be under methodology. 13. Page 5, line 65: Please mention categorically the sources of your data 14. Page 5: line 69-70: Which method of interpolation did you used? Ordinary kriging or IDW? Please specify and provide some details of this method including formula/equation. 15. Page 6, line 80: Please define. 16. Page 6, line 84: Are there no latest refs on this method? 17. Page 6, line 90-92: Good, however, where do you adopt this method? Do you mean it wasn't used before? Please cite the refs. 18. Page 7, line 106: Pleas define 19. Page 7. Line 112-113: I disagree with this claim. Please see some latest refs Mesoproterozoic area; 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2667325821002909</p> <p>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301926821003910</p> <p>20. Page 11, line 171 – 174: Is this finding in agreement with previous findings from the same watershed or other watersheds analysed using the same methods? Please discuss</p> <p>21. Page 12, line 93-95: Overall the presentation is good but discussion is lack. Please discuss your results within the context of current literature on the topic.</p> <p>22. Page 13, Conclusion: Page 12, line 93-95: Please add details on implications of your findings. What economic/environmental benefits can be derived from these findings?</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Page 5, line 62: This sentence is unnecessary. 2. Page 8, line 117: Please enhance the quality of this map by increasing the font size. 3. Page 8, line 140: Please increase the font size. 4. Page 10, Fig 6&7: Increase the font size 5. Page 11, line 178: ref 8 years old, please update. 6. Page 12, Figure 9: Increase the font, coordinates not readable 7. 	
Optional/General comments	Nil	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saadu Umar Wali
Department, University & Country	Federal University Birnin Kebbi, Nigeria