

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_97756
Title of the Manuscript:	Monitoring LC-LU by remote sensing and spatial information (study area: Tehran city)
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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/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)	Yes Modify the title of the manuscript Yes Include the objective of the study and discussion section Novelty of the manuscript can be improved using advance classification methods such as machine learning and deep learning Number of references used are limited and citations need to be improved of recent year publication on this field. Refer http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJETM.2022.10048734, http://dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJETM.2022.10052058, DOI: 10.35940/ijeat.A1879.109119 Figures and tables are not cited in the text, performance of the classifier is not compared, limitation of the study should include in the discussion section. This literature should be briefly reviewed and integrated to serve as the conceptual context on how you interpret your results What future directions in research are suggested from your findings and conclusions. How does it improve our overall understanding of the subject material? Performance of classifier need to be compared. The research results and conclusions should be more specific and better digitized. Improve the grammar quality and paper layout, and enhance the readability and hierarchy of the paper. Please add more citations including previous papers with similar studies to highlight the relevance of this paper All of these should be addressed in the context of the cited peer reviewed literature.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Manuscript is required minor corrections to improve the quality of the manuscript.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mahendra H N
Department, University & Country	JSS Academy of Technical Education, India