

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_88647
Title of the Manuscript:	ESTIMATION AND STUDY OF FOREST LOSS AND GAIN USING SPATIAL DATASET ACROSS DISTRICTS OF UTTARAKHAND
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I suggest adding a commentary for each Figure of the results and discussion Section to avoid that number of pictures and charts without any explanation.</p> <p>In the Result analysis section, I suggest the same as above. It is also important to make some correlations between the findings and the literature review.</p> <p>In a scientific paper it is necessary to add a section for the conclusion. Where it is expected to add some suggestions for further researches. It is also relevant to mention the contributions of the study for academic purposes as well as for the studied object.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract the authors mentioned the objective of the study, but in the Introduction section they mention some different objectives. It would be better to state them in the same pattern.</p> <p>There are many words without space, such as... from GlobalForestWatch</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The research is relevant and bring useful contributions for country as well as the studies on this area, but the authors did not explore it properly for a scientific paper.</p> <p>I suggest adding more literature review bases in the Introduction or in a new section specifically designed for it, in order to support the discussion and the conclusion of the paper.</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:	Ana Alice Vilas Boas
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal de Lavras, Brasil