

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112011
Title of the Manuscript:	Validation of the Sentinel-2 biophysical parameters derived from the SNAP toolbox with in-situ measurements in Anand district for accuracy assessment
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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. This manuscript is important to the scientific community, for some reasons: a) This study bridges the gap between satellite-derived information and ground-based measurements, b) This research contributes to the scientific community by providing a methodology for validating biophysical parameters derived from Sentinel-2 data, c) essential for improving the credibility and usability of remote sensing data, contributing to scientific knowledge, and facilitating informed decision-making in various fields</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable</p> <p>3. The abstract is less comprehensive, some things need to be added, research objectives, data, and data analysis techniques.</p> <p>4. Yes, essentially the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate but acknowledgments and competing interests need to be added.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references are lacking and not up to date. Please increase the references and use the last 5 years.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes it is</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. Abstract: Some things that need to be added, are research objectives, data, and data analysis techniques.</p> <p>2. Introduction use capital letters: INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3. The references are not up to date introduction</p> <p>4. Result and Discussion: Elaborate your research results for each sub-result with existing research. Please add references to create a proper discussion</p> <p>5. References: The references are lacking and not up to date. Please increase the references and use the last 5 years.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Ajun Purwanto
Department, University & Country	Institute of Teacher Training and Education, Teachers' Association of the Republic of Indonesia, Indonesia