

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_124584
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of above-ground biomass of moist deciduous forest in Mundgod taluk of Uttara Kannada district from geo-informatics using a modelling technique
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

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 assessment of above-ground biomass in moist deciduous forests, particularly using geo-informatics and modelling techniques, aligns with current scientific trends in sustainable forest management and carbon stock estimation. Forest biomass studies are increasingly vital due to their role in carbon sequestration, which is critical for mitigating climate change. In this context, the use of remote sensing and geo-informatics tools allows for more accurate, large-scale, and time-efficient assessments compared to traditional methods.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, title is not suitable because only district was mentioned. Clarified location by adding "Karnataka, India" to make it more recognizable to readers unfamiliar with the district. Suggested new titles- 1. Assessment of above-ground biomass in Mundgod taluk of in Uttara Kannada's moist deciduous forests: A geo-informatics and using a modelling technique Or 2. Geo-informatics and modelling for above-ground biomass estimation in moist deciduous forests of Uttara Kannada, Karnataka, India	
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.	Need to rewrite the abstract after incorporation of major revision provided in MS.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, conclusion is not added. Need to rewrite the MS as required correction and comments is given in MS.	
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.	Material and methods is not written properly as I found that study area, study period and other required description and major revision is needed. Also need to add appropriate references in formulas used and other details is required. As comments are given in MS.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Many reference are very old and not correlated with present study and many references are missing or not cited in MS. Kindly check the MS.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, found suitable. But many grammatical flaws and language proficiency was noticed during review.	
Optional/General comments		
	Discussion is not upto the mark, only few studies were taken. Therefore, I suggest author to revise the discussion by adding new related work from India and other parts of the world.	

Review Form 3

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:	Biplov Chandra Sarkar
Department, University & Country	GLA University, India