

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_103574
Title of the Manuscript:	A UAS-based hyperspectral solution for vegetative remote sensing
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. In my opinion, the manuscript is not important for scientific community yet. It is a good start and I feel that this is work in progress and it could be once the author completes the papre.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is not suitable at this time. The author is limiting the article to Vegetation and my question is WHY? I recommend to remove the word vegetation from the title.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive for what they mentioned but it is not enough.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are not sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/ English quality is acceptable. Please remove the first tense from the article.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>At this time, the article does not belong in a scholarly peer reviewed journal. If the authors want to keep the word Vegetation in the title, I recommend that they fly the drone and demonstrate the results of their recommendations. I would recommend demonstrating the results of their vegetation pre/post or without/with the recommendations. May be a table to demonstrate the quality and accuracy.</p> <p>I recommend this paper has the potential of being published after the authors modify the article.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seta Boghikian-Whitby
Department, University & Country	University of La Verne, USA