

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97037
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of LULC changes in Samastipur District of Bihar (India) using Geo-informatics
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

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)	1. Yes, it is, especially at a local level because a balance between land agriculture areas and natural areas should be checked and rethought. 2. The title is suitable. 3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. 4. Yes, the structure of the manuscript is appropriate. 5. I think that the manuscript is correct. 6. Some references are not recent (1977, 1985) and it will be useful for the paper if the authors will see more references from Europe.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	1. There are many minor English mistakes. Please, correct them.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Mihaela Tinca Udristioiu
Department, University & Country	University of Craiova, Romania