

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Global Ecology and Environment |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JOGEE_12287 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Mapping Vegetation Types and Land Use Dynamics in Kanyabaha Wetland from 1990 to 2021 |
| Type of the Article | |

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> |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Mapping Vegetation Types and Land Use Dynamics in Kanyabaha Wetland from 1990 to 2021</p> <p style="text-align: center;">REVIEW</p> <p>General Comments:</p> <p>Overall Structure: The article is well-structured with a clear abstract, introduction, methodology, results, and conclusion. It provides a comprehensive analysis of vegetation dynamics using remote sensing data over three decades.</p> <p>Clarity and Precision: The language is precise and technical, appropriate for a scientific audience. However, consider improving the flow and readability by breaking down complex sentences.</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The abstract effectively summarizes the key findings and significance of the study. It might be helpful to briefly mention the tools which were used for statistical analysis used in the analysis to give a clearer picture of the | |

methodology. Also include a note on accuracy assessment.

Introduction:

- The introduction highlights the importance of wetlands and the specific focus on Kanyabaha Wetland. It addresses the gap in existing studies well.
- Consider citing more recent and relevant studies to strengthen the background. The significance of the study could be emphasized more to highlight the implications of the findings for policy and conservation efforts.

Methodology:

- Write a detailed note on why the study area has been considered under study site description.
- The use of Landsat imagery and classification using ArcMap is appropriate. However, it would be beneficial to include more details about the classification techniques and accuracy assessment methods.
- In satellite specification table also include the source from where the imagery were downloaded.
- Including a flowchart of the methodology could help readers better understand the steps taken in the analysis.

Results:

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The results are presented clearly, with significant findings on the changes in vegetation cover over time. The use of statistical analyses and transition matrices adds depth to the analysis.• Visual aids such as maps and graphs depicting land use changes over the years would enhance the presentation of results and make it more accessible to readers, especially vegetation cover changes.• The maps can be made better, which can include the north arrow, scale bar, and include separate legend for each year, separately, and give a background so that the maps become more appealing, since it LULC study, maps should more readable. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The discussion effectively interprets the findings and relates them to global trends in wetland degradation. It would be helpful to discuss potential drivers of the observed changes in more detail, such as specific anthropogenic activities.• Consider exploring the implications of these changes on local communities and biodiversity in more depth. <p>Conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The conclusion succinctly summarizes the key findings and stresses the need for conservation strategies. It would be beneficial to propose specific recommendations for | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>policy-makers and stakeholders based on the study's findings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highlighting potential future research directions could provide a roadmap for further studies in this area. <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The references are relevant and up-to-date. Ensure that all citations in the text match the reference list and consider including more recent publications to support the findings. <p>Technical Comments:</p> <p>Accuracy Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The reported accuracy (>75%) is good, but more details on the accuracy assessment process, such as confusion matrices and kappa coefficients, would add credibility. <p>Remote Sensing Techniques:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing more details on the preprocessing steps (e.g., atmospheric correction, georeferencing) would enhance the reproducibility of the study. <p>GIS Analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The use of transition matrices is commendable. Including spatial metrics and landscape indices could provide additional | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | insights into the fragmentation and connectivity of different land use types. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | | |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | | |
| Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. | | |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments | | |
| Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | | |
| Optional/General comments | | |

PART 2:

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | M Sasi |
| Department, University & Country | JSS Academy of Higher Education and Research, India |