

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_85244
Title of the Manuscript:	Land Use-Land Cover Change Detection in East Godavari District, India (2002-2020)
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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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	<div>1. The paper is an interesting assessment of the status of land use-land cover changes in the East Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh in India, between 2002 and 2020, with the aid of ArcGIS 10.1 software. However, the paper needs significant improvements to make it publishable. As is stands, the paper lacks some essential attributes that are required to strengthen its analytical and scientific rigour. The necessary attributes include (a) an amended title (b) suitable research questions or hypotheses (c) a compelling conceptual framework, which may be a standalone or be combined with a good literature review, and (d) correction of all grammatical errors. Please see copy of attached revised manuscript.</div> <div>2. The topic should be refined as indicated to make it more specific.</div> <div>3. In addition to using suitable research questions/hypotheses, the findings should be presented in response to each research question in a systematic fashion.</div> <div>4. The author(s) should try and operationalize “Total Corrected Sample (TCS)” under Accuracy Assessment Test. How was the sample size calculated based on what sampling frame, if applicable? What is the significance and relevance of the sample to your paper? In what way is it relevant to your research questions?</div> <div>5. Table 3 is technically/graphically bogus! The authors should remove the straight lines indicating rows and columns.</div> <div>6. The conclusion should be a standalone section of the paper. It is too simplistic as presented. Please see comments in front. The authors should re-write the Disclaimer in plain language that does not complicate their status as contributors to the paper. Under the disclaimer at the end of the paper, what does the author mean by “producers of products”? If the products are just the equipment or software used for data collection and analysis, this reference to products is redundant and unnecessary in a journal paper.</div>	
Minor REVISION comments	<div>1. I have suggested some corrections to some specific words or phrases to guide the author(s).</div> <div>2. The disclaimer at the end of the paper should be improved as suggested.</div> <div>3. The list of references will be more comprehensive by the time the author(s) introduce(s) a relevant conceptual framework and literature review.</div>	
Optional/General comments	<div>1. The entire paper should be thoroughly proof-read after all the above corrections have been done. Alternatively, the author(s) should seek help from a fluent or native English Language speaker</div>	

Comment [JB1]: add

Comment [JB2]: You need to attend to these 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jacob Adejare Babarinde
Department, University & Country	PNG University of Technology, Canada