

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96009
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Change Detection of Vegetative Covers in Kalara Nala Watershed of Damoh District Using Remote Sensing and GIS Technique
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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- Manuscript entitled "A study on change detection of vegetative covers in Kalara Nala Watershed of Damoh District Using Remote Sensing and GIS Technique" is scientific topic of interest for research community. Authors have used significant GIS/RS techniques to analyze the vegetation change before and after watershed development program in the region. Manuscript needs major revisions</p> <p>2- Title needs to a little revision. The 1st 3 words from the title should be removed</p> <p>3- Abstract needs to be rephrased. Spelling mistakes should be corrected. There is double spacing at some places. Author starts the abstract from "soil and water resources" but article covers about the vegetation change. The 1st three lines should be restructured according to research objectives. Next, "all studies related to" should be removed. This line is not appropriate. Overall, abstract needs improvement.</p> <p>4- Major sections and headings are fine. Heading 2.2 and 2.3 should be merged under one heading "remote sensing data used" There is no need of word "map" in the text and figures. It should be removed. Table 2 is not necessary, Instead, every "land use class" should be described in the table. Table 5 & 6 can be merged in one table in comprehensive manner of %age. For appropriate change detection analysis, area change of each class should be calculated in ha and %age and presented in graphical form to describe the change in vegetation in studied time period. Heading 3.2 and stream order map should be the part of methodology.</p> <p>5- Overall, Manuscript keeps a scientific approach. English editing of the manuscript is required.</p> <p>6- References needs an extensive improvement. Introduction and Discussion section should be extensively revised with updated studies on the topic Further...</p> <p>7- Why authors preferred for unsupervised classification. As the study is being done to evaluate the impact of watershed management practice. In this case, supervised classification approach is more appropriate. Justify this point. Moreover, Objectives of the study should be clearly stated at the last paragraph of Introduction section.</p> <p>8- The authors are recommended to add NDVI analysis in the study years to present the vegetation change analysis. Results needs to be discussed with reference to other studies in the region probably in the separate portion of "Discussion."</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Requires extensive English editing.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Overall, Topic is interesting but lacks in scientific writing and presentation. However, it can be improved by following the comments in above section.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sana Arshad
Department, University & Country	The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan