

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_88187
Title of the Manuscript:	MAPPING SPATIO-TEMPORAL VARIATIONS OF SURFACE WATER AREA OF TANKS IN COIMBATORE CORPORATION USING GOOGLE EARTH ENGINE
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The use of Landsat 7 which has a line strip error needs to be noted. The note in question is how the researcher processes or minimizes the error for the research area. This is important so that the results of the analysis do not become misclassified, which will later lead to wrong conclusions. The explanation will be good if it is explained in point 2.3. In the introduction, in the second paragraph it is stated that the use of GEE improves efficiency and cost. For this reason, the results of the analysis need to be elaborated on how efficient the use of GEE is in this study. And how much cheaper it is to use GEE compared to other systems. Of course, the comparison can be used by existing references, if the analysis has not been carried out in this study The selection of the use of bands in satellite imagery, as well as the selection of Random Forest, it is also necessary to explain the reasons for such a reservoir-related study. In the methodology (point 2.2), it is better if the explanation of the sentence is explained first, then the picture is placed under the explanation. The analysis of the results of Figures 5 to 12 should be given a narrative of the findings, and compared with other similar studies. At least it is related to the two terminology that is used, namely cost and efficiency. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comparing the results of the analysis using RF in GEE with other similar studies is very necessary. The emphasis on writing conclusions, which leads to findings related to the cost and efficiency of using GEE in this study, needs to be put forward 	
Optional/General comments	In general it is good, but it is necessary to emphasize two things, namely: a). formulation of findings related to cost and efficiency in using GEE for the study; and b) related to comparison with previous research	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Dimyati
Department, University & Country	University of Indonesia, Indonesia