

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_120047
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing Multi-decadal Landmass Changes and River Bank Erosion in the Char Areas of Majuli River Island of Assam: A Case Study
Type of the 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

<p>This study focuses on evaluating the potential of Radar Altimetry, GIS and Remote Sensing data for quantitative geomorphological analysis of riverbank erosion in the Brahmaputra River basin. The authors chose Majuli Island (in the Assam Basin) in eastern India, as the study area and explored the applicability of SOI and Landsat data to develop maps: (1) changes characterizing the regression of the land mass following the erosion of the banks of the rivers in the area, (2) multi-date erosion of the banks, (3) alluvial deposits witnessing detachments of soil materials. The change map was based on the calculation of the NDWI using thresholding and classification techniques on the new images. The scientific problem of this article is clear, the intention is good and valuable. However, some issues remain when reviewing the study, processing the data, developing the methodology, and discussing the results. This reduces the value of this item to some extent. We therefore hope that the authors will be able to properly revise the article and improve it taking into account our comments.</p> <p>The title is less coherent.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>(1) The authors provide a detailed description of the background of the study and its importance, but they do not raise the question addressed in this article and there is no literature review of the research methods and data on similar problems. Authors are requested to provide additional information.</p> <p>(2) Please clearly indicate the research that will be carried out in this article at the end of the introduction.</p> <p>MATERIAL AND METHODS</p> <p>(1) The data section is not described clearly and specifically. The topographic sheet(s) provided by the SOI: number, year, scale, etc. must be indicated in detail. The spatial and temporal resolutions of the latter data must also be indicated in this section.</p> <p>(2) The spatial resolutions of the SOI data and Landsat images are different, did the authors carry out certain processing when extracting the occupancy change data, if so, please give a description.</p> <p>(3) The issues related to the methods section are: 1) each method is used to solve which problem should be given a research-friendly explanation at the end of the introduction; 2) letters in formulas must have a clear meaning and should not be ignored; and 3) this part of the writing is weak, so it is recommended to streamline it.</p> <p>SOI data comes from which band? Each objective must be clearly associated with an appropriate method.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>(1) Each result must be linked to a method, this is not observed throughout the text.</p> <p>(2) Please reserve a comment for each figure in order to improve the consistency of the manuscript.</p> <p>(3) The results deserve to be seriously discussed to enhance the originality of your scientific contribution.</p> <p>(4) Can the authors discuss the role of climate change and human activities in the results obtained?</p> <p>(5) Also discuss the limitation of SOI data in such a study?</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p>	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
---	---------------------------	---

Review Form 1.7

<p>The conclusion summarizes the results well, but we do not feel in this part the reminder of the research problem, the objectives of the manuscript and the methodology applied.</p>		
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The summary is less strong and deserves to be complete with good structuring.</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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript has the great structures for scientific communication, but it must be improved to rationalize its value.</p> <p>Depending on the content of the manuscript, we propose to the authors the following reformulation: CONTRIBUTION OF GIS AND REMOTE SENSING IN THE MULTI-DATE EVALUATION OF EROSION ACTIVITY IN THE ARTICLE CHAR AREAS OF THE MAJULI RIVER ISLAND.</p> <p>We observed a weak link between: the objectives, the methodology and the results. It is acceptable with the correction</p> <p>More than 90% of the references mentioned in the manuscript are not recent. Authors must respect the 50% share of references from the last five years. And they must also respect the citation style indicated by the journal editor.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are fewer concerns about the quality of the language used in writing the manuscript</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>REFERENCES More than 90% of the references mentioned in the manuscript are not recent. Authors must respect the 50% share of references from the last five years. And they must also respect the citation style indicated by the journal editor.</p>	

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:	Tshibangu Wailunga John
Department, University & Country	University of Lubumbashi, Democratic Republic of Congo