

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_120894
Title of the Manuscript:	PREPARATION OF LAND USE LAND COVER (LULC) FOR PANCHGANGA RIVER BASIN USING REMOTE SENSING AND GIS
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Despite being a very popular topic from the point of view of the approach used, I did a Google search to see similar topics for this region and couldn't find it. That's why I consider it relevant and can serve as an instrument to assist in decision-making for the reality of this region. The article does not present any innovation in methodology and we are in an era of seeking to improve methodologies and approaches due to recent technological advances and challenges in data processing. Even so, for the reality of the region, the study is relevant.	Yes, although the topic is widely studied, my search revealed that there are no similar studies focusing on this specific region. This gap highlights the relevance of the study, as it provides valuable insights that can aid in decision-making for this particular area. While the article does not introduce new methodologies, it is important to note that it serves as a crucial reference given the current technological advancements and challenges in data processing. The study remains highly relevant for understanding the LULC patterns in this region as included. Further, I will work on
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It needs to be improved. Suggestions: 1. Integrating Remote Sensing and GIS for LULC Studies in the Panchganga River Region 2. Land Use and Land Cover Analysis of the Panchganga Basin through GIS and Remote Sensing Techniques.	Updated as below: Integrating Remote Sensing and GIS for LULC Studies in the lower Panchganga River basin
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.	In the third line of the abstract, the author refers to a study carried out in 1991, 2001, 2011 and 2021 and immediately afterwards proposes to carry out a similar study for the same period. Is that really what I understood? If so, what is the need to carry out this study when there is already one that was carried out using the same approach? If your refer to the same study please correct the previous statement.	The abstract mentions a study analyzing LULC for the years 1991, 2001, 2011, and 2021 and then suggests conducting a similar study for the same period. This was indeed a misunderstanding. The study referenced in the abstract is the one being discussed, and the intention is not to replicate the analysis for the same period but to highlight the importance of these findings and their relevance for future research and decision-making. I will revise the abstract to clarify that the current study provides a foundational analysis of LULC changes over these years.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it is appropriated.	Yes.
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 article does not present any innovation in methodology and we are in an era of seeking to improve methodologies and approaches due to recent technological advances and challenges in data processing. Some comments: In the last period of the introduction, he mentions a project, mentions its objective, and then presents the objective of this study. Are the project and this study the same thing or is this study within this project? It got a little confusing. Figure 1 should be placed right after topic 2.1.1 The results and discussion topic has the number 5 instead of 3. The same happens in the Summary and Conclusions topic, which should be 4 instead of 6.	Regarding the methodology, while the article does not introduce new innovations, it provides a crucial baseline study for the region. The focus is on establishing foundational insights that can aid in decision-making despite the current advancements and challenges in the field. Combining spatial data with multi-spectral images involves the integration of GIS and remote sensing for land use and land cover classification. GIS software such as QGIS facilitates this integration. A detailed long-term analysis included in the study offers significant insight into the processes of land change in the Panchganga river basin. The introduction is revised to make it clear for readers to understand the scope and focus of the research. I have relocated Figure 1 to follow the section 2.1.1. I have also corrected the numbering of Result and Discussion and Summary and Conclusions
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Yes, but I would include some traditional ones that I consider important for analysing accuracy. Cohen J., "A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales", Educational and Psychological Measurement, Volume: 20 issue: 1, pp. 37-46, April, 1960. Landis J. R. e Koch G. G. "The Measurement of Observer Agreement for Categorical Data", Biometrics, Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 159-174. Mar., 1977.	Based on the flow of the study, the references used are relevant and appropriately support the research.

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>I am not able to assess the level of English at this level.</p>	<p>I have written this manuscript to the best of my ability. If further modifications are needed in terms of language, I am prepared to make those revisions.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>To better illustrate the transitions, I would suggest including a diagram, such as the Sankey diagram.</p>	<p>I feel that it may not be essential but I will include in some of my further studies.</p>

PART 2:

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