

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105661
Title of the Manuscript:	Mapping Asian Elephant Habitat Suitability Index in Alur Taluk, Central Western Ghats: A GIS, Remote Sensing, and Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) Approach for Conservation Assessment
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>)

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. Indeed, the information in the letter is important, but very limited for those in charge of managing and conserving elephants in the area.</p> <p>2. The title is highly appropriate.</p> <p>3. Due to the fact that the objectives are not clearly addressed, there is a lack of information on the results</p> <p>4. I would expect that just as there was a division into subsections in the data analysis, that order would be followed in the results section.</p> <p>5. No, it lacks scientific support in the introduction, materials and methods, results and conclusion sections</p> <p>6. No, it is necessary to add references in the justification part of the topic and data analysis. They also have to be updated.</p> <p>Throughout the writing, the way of citing is not unified</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. yes, it is adequate</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is not clear in the objectives, for this reason in the section on materials and methods the development of these is not well reflected.</p> <p>The figures are not cited in the entire text, in addition to how they are arranged, it is confusing.</p> <p>The way of citing the references in the text is not uniform</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:	López-Rojas Victor Ignacio
Department, University & Country	Universidad Autónoma de Guerrero, México