

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_97754
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigating the changes of water basins by remote sensing method (Case study: Lake Tar and Hoyer)
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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically advantageous and important for increasing knowledge of water changes in the basin via time series.</p> <p>The title is not appropriate. Maybe it should be "RS-based assessment: spatial-temporal changes in water basins of Tar and Hoyer lake" or any other attractive title should be developed.</p> <p>The abstract is appropriate.</p> <p>Structure of the paper is not good and not followed the guidelines. It should be revised.</p> <p>Manuscript is looks correct but the structure and write up is not clear according to the results, objectives of the study.</p> <p>References are enough.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English of the written article is suitable but also revised.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main target of the manuscript to detect and investigating changes of water basins and classification have done via supervised and unsupervised or vector machine. But in the manuscript, there is a lot of methods explained. The manuscript should be revised and to the specific and to the points. All the figures must be clear and in full resolution. Flow chart spell and diagram is not suitable. Should be changed or redeveloped. Figures and tables should be captioned. There are no references mentioned of figures in the text. All the figures tables should be mentioned and explained in the text. Equations should be mathematical form in the MS word. Accuracy of the classification like overall accuracy and kappa, user's producer's accuracy should be mentioned in the tables. Figures should be merged or grouped otherwise separate with captions. 	

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:	Shoukat Ali Shah
Department, University & Country	Wuhan University, China