

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_127296
Title of the Manuscript:	Geospatial Analysis of LULC in the Srinagar Region of Jammu and Kashmir using Sentinel-2 data
Type of the Article	Journal

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study addresses a significant topic, focusing on LULC mapping using Sentinel-2 data in a Himalayan region. The findings provide valuable insights for sustainable resource management. However, the discussion section could better integrate how the results contribute to broader geospatial and environmental management practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract does not explicitly emphasize what sets this study apart from previous LULC mapping efforts in similar regions. This could be highlighted.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No Include a subsection detailing the study area's population density and land-use pressures to connect ecological issues with human activities. The methodology for "Accuracy assessment" could clarify the rationale behind using specific metrics (e.g., Kappa coefficient).	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The LULC class area percentages could be better highlighted with a comparative analysis. Discussion of error matrix results would benefit from a comparison with benchmarks from similar studies. The manuscript is well-structured and well-detailed for its intended audience. Addressing the above suggestions will improve readability and impact.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	No In the literature review section, you can include the following related papers which enhance the credibility of the discussion Mishra, S.P., Sethi, K.C., Mishra, D.P., Siddique, M., Pre-Monsoon Cyclogenesis over Bay of Bengal, International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering, 2019, 8 (2), 4895-4908;	

Review Form 3

	Mishra, S.P., Nayak, S.P., Mishra, S., Siddique, M., Sethi, K.C.: GIS and auto desk modeling for satellite cities around Bhubaneswar, International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering, 2019, 8(11), pp. 297–306 Mishra, S.P., Nayak, S.P., Mishra, S., Siddique, M., Sethi, K.C.: GIS and auto desk modeling for satellite cities around Bhubaneswar, International Journal of Innovative Technology and Exploring Engineering, 2019, 8(11), pp. 297–306.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is generally well-structured. The sections are logical, but some subsections, such as "Materials and Methods," could benefit from additional technical details to enhance reproducibility	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Siddique
Department, University & Country	Centurion University of Technology and Management, India