

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_121845
Title of the Manuscript:	Time Series Study Of Vegetation Cover Of Bhitarkanika National Park Region, Odisha, India Using Geospatial Technology
Type of the 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	There should be a more appropriate title. The author needs to reconsider the title.	
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 is comprehensive in written format. However; it does not agree with the study. The author fails to match each point with the topic and objectives because of a lack of review.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The sub sections have weak reviews, as mentioned above. The author needs to review more previous studies on the topic, try to add more informative points to make better results and focus on the results and discussion section.	
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 manuscript in its current format is not robust scientifically and technically as it is based on general ideas. Many studies already concluded on the topic. It does not add any new informative points or findings to the research area. Additionally, conclusions are doubtful and inappropriate. I suggest the author reconsider your study methods and results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient. The author needs to add more strong review references according to the study.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The message conveyed in the manuscript should be as unambiguous as possible; hence, the author should put more effort into writing. There are grammatical mistakes that need to be corrected.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript entitled "Time Series Study of Vegetation Cover of Bhitarkanika National Park Region Odisha, India Using Geospatial Technology" in its current format is not worth publication as it fails to contribute to the research area. 2. The research objectives have neither been elaborated accordingly nor have a robust methodology. Additionally, it has technical writing and result interpretation issues. 3. The result interpretation appears inappropriate. 4. The LULC data interpretation has not been concluded accurately, as the LULC class shift results in maps are unacceptable. Open land classes are not classified correctly visually and collectively. 5. The author should elaborate on the model sensitivity because it enables the researchers to understand the model parameters and requirements. 6. Reconsider the methodology, classification, and prediction process. The classification results are inappropriate and must have affected the prediction in the study area. 7. The manuscript has grammatical issues which need to be corrected. <p>There are minor, major mistakes as the measured area defined in the abstract is different than the area defined in the table, and in methodology, the author introduces Landsat 7 and in Table Landsat 5. Try to avoid such mistakes and make your manuscript strongly and technically written.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. I suggest the author reconsider your study and understand the model sensitivity. Try to classify map results accurately so that it helps you predict scenarios for the future. 	

PART 2:

	<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>
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Habibullah Abbasi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Sindh, Pakistan</p>