

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_128053
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Forest Aboveground Biomass, Using L-Band SAR Data Through Linear Modeling Approaches in Joida Taluk, Uttara Kannada
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The article is within the scope of the journal. The authors presented a well-organized paper that was easy to read and follow. 2. In this paper, the authors conducted a study in Joida taluk of Uttara Kannada district to assess the forest's aboveground biomass using L band data and attempted to estimate it using SAR backscatter. 3. The authors used the point center quadrat (PCQ) method to select the tree and collect its growth parameters, viz., tree height, breast height (DBH), and diameter at the tree base. 4. The authors have measured the tree crown density with a densitometer. Each sample plot of forest aboveground biomass (AGB) was estimated using specific gravity and field-measured forest parameters. 5. The authors concluded that an SAR backscatter-based Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) model was implemented to retrieve the forest aboveground biomass of the study area. The cross-polarization showed a good correlation with forest aboveground biomass. 6. There is a clear methodology. There is an extensive explanation of the method and a discussion of the results. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The article's title is relatively long and might need to be clarified. I suggest the authors present an informative, more concise title for the revised version of the manuscript.	
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, while informative, could be more explicit about the key findings and contributions of the research. Including specific results from the case study could enhance its impact.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article has to be slightly revised. For example, I suggest the authors rewrite the last sentence of the abstract: "The results obtained from this study recommend the use of PolSAR-based MLR to estimate the AGB of forest vegetation."</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>1. The article's title is relatively long and might need to be clarified. I suggest the authors present an informative, more concise title for the revised version of the manuscript.</p> <p>2. The abstract, while informative, could be more explicit about the key findings and contributions of the research. Including specific results from the case study could enhance its impact.</p> <p>3. The language of the article has to be slightly revised. For example, I suggest the authors rewrite the last sentence of the abstract: "The results obtained from this study recommend the use of PolSAR-based MLR to estimate the AGB of forest vegetation."</p> <p>4. The authors have to enumerate all the sections and subsections of the manuscript according to their first appearance.</p> <p>5. It is not preferred to have subheadings directly after headings, such as in Section 2. Please add one or two sentences to introduce the section and keep the paper flowing.</p> <p>6. Tables and equations are not preferred to be mentioned in the conclusion section of the manuscript.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jawad K. Ali</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Technology, Iraq</p>