

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_102985</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Land Use and Land Cover Change Detection Using Satellite Data RS &amp; GIS, A case study of Sawangi watershed of Yavatmal district, Maharashtra</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Yes, the use of remote sensing and GIS plays an important role in determining the change in the use of soils and vegetation, they also perform a classification per year performing a validation.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Yes.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Yes.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Yes.</b></li> <li>5. <b>I suggest giving another review in the English translation.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Many of the references in the document are not cited in the text.</b></li> </ol>	
<p><b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>See manuscript for comments on the writing.</p> <p><b>Doubts and questions regarding work:</b></p> <p>1. It is understood that landsat imagery was used and made a visual interpretation based on false color. On the moment, everything's fine. It is further understood that they used a supervised classification. The first question is, how did you make this classification based on auxiliary field data? This question is derived from Table 2.</p> <p>I only see the digital elevation model on the location map, apart from this I don't see any other use for it.</p> <p>The images of Sentinel 2, I understand that it could be used for the year 2017, but it is not mentioned in the document, but rather it is focused on Landsat.</p> <p>Soil data, geomorphology, and google earth in which they used it?</p> <p>2. In the validation, knowing the process of analysis of changes in land use and vegetation, the precision of the classification is in accordance with the supervised classification of the classes based on the pixels classified as the class and those classified, therefore the use of an error matrix. So my question is, why did you use the auxiliary data for the classification? It occurs to me that in the pixels that did not exist changes in the three years, they have validated it directly in the field, giving robustness to the generated classification.</p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>3. The results do not describe the accuracy of class classification or its validation.</p> <p>4. Finally they mention that they used the QGIS software, but they do not mention how they performed the spatial analysis, if they created their own script, if they installed any additional package.</p> <p><b>Suggestion: The work is interesting, however, there are many gaps that raise doubts. My suggestion is to correctly delimit the research work in the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- supervised classification using landsat data.</li> <li>- validate the classification.</li> <li>- Analysis of changes in land use and vegetation.</li> </ul> <p><b>If for the validation of the classification they used auxiliary data, now it is necessary to mention how they were used and what was obtained from it.</b></p> <p><b>In short, it would be to restructure materials and methods, and results.</b></p>	
--	---	--

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Miguel Armando López Beltrán</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Autonomous University of Sinaloa, México</b>