

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_85237
Title of the Manuscript:	Land Use Land Cover Classification of Burhner River Watershed Using Remote Sensing and GIS Technique
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>)

Review Form 1.6

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>The scope of the research is limited. Author(s) used well-established approach to obtain LULCC at local scale. Research methodology and quality of results including figures are good. However, author(s) must need to improve the following section for better understanding.</p> <p>Introduction section is still weak. Need to elaborate more with citations.</p> <p>Recommended articles: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877343513000936 https://doi.org/10.3390/environments4020034 https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s13280-021-01510-4 https://doi.org/10.3390/rs13204090</p> <p>There is no proper discussion section in this manuscript. Please include it in the manuscript.</p> <p>Database: I have concern about data acquisition, what author(s) want to achieve by just classify the single satellite imagery of Sentinel. I think, author(s) can enhance the objective of this research by using multiple earth observation dataset for better outcomes.</p> <p>Conclusion section is too general. Author(s) just repeated what is already written in previous section. It is better to include the implication and future direction of this research.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The introduction section has been improved with more citations highlighted in the text.2. The discussion section has been appropriately added illustrating the pros, cons of unsupervised classification as well as the key factors responsible for adopting such classification technique.3. The present study do not illustrate change detection in LULC classification as it primarily demonstrates the utility, merits, demerits and key factors responsible for performing unsupervised classification in obtaining LULC information at watershed scale and hence the section of change detection has not been added.4. The future directions and implication of the present investigation has been added appropriately.
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Please articulate the novelty of this research in abstract, introduction, discussion, and conclusion section.</p> <p>Please make sure all dash, space, a hyphen, en dash, and capital words would be appropriate throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Please make sure the font size is in all figures, tables, and text.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The described suggestions has been appropriately added in the manuscript.2. The manuscript has been checked for appropriate dash, space, hyphen, en dash and capital words.3. The fonts size has been checked for similarity in font sizes.
Optional/General comments		

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>	