Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JGEESI_62099**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A Geographical Analysis of Challakere Amrit Mahal Kaval Grasslands: Using Remote Sensing and GIS Technologies**
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 https://ditdo.in/-62099'**, 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI 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	In general, the study is good, however, the below mentioned recommendations should be considered if the author(s) want this article published in the future depending on the sound judgement of the editor. Good luck. The following comments and suggestion are hereby presented for the author(s) to consider: 1) The abstract needs to be read and checked by a native English language speaker since there are some minor grammar errors that were observed. 2) The Introduction/ Background of the Study provided a substantial basis for the study. However, the author(s) needs to provide more recent and updated literature that would support the study at hand. This can also make the study more scholarly. It has been also observed that some of the literature were quite outdated this time around a more recent one should be the best choice (at least 5 years from the publication date) more over research question, objectives and statement of the problems are not clearly shown shows the research gap. 3) The Materials and Methods should discuss clearly, and spelling and grammar checks should be observed. Example: • .Principal Components Analysis (PCA) processed for satellite image spectral enhancement supporting with literature should display • Image enhancement and how the researcher was clipped to the study area to speed up the data processing supported with literature • What about Classification scheme, training site selection and data collection? • .Cleary shows steps from beginning of the acquisition and classification of multitemporal satellite image of the study area to the extraction of the required land class cover classification map of the study area? 4) 4) The Results and Discussion needs to be separated. Since it is a common misinterpretation by some researchers but this portion should be separated for the purpose of clarification of ideas and argument purposes only. In the case of the current manuscript, it is observed that there is a lengthy discussion of each table. This idea is highly discouraged since most readers do not have time to read over a lengthy study. It is then advised to highlight only the most significant ideas in the table. Also, it is discouraged to repeat what has been shown in the table and discuss it again in the text or explanation. Readers will get bored. The discussion for the table should be concise and precise. For the Discussion part, this portion is where you have an in-depth analyis of the results, to substantiate the results of the study, related literatures are suggested to be mentioned in this portion of the study. 5) Conclusion and recommendation, this portion not only presented or provided the general	1) Thank you, the mentioned comment is resolved in the revised manuscript. 2) Thank you, there are a lot of references in the introduction to the study, but the theme of my study is from 2009 to 2019. References to this are the same period time reference. 3) Thank you, I have removed it because there was a problem with the accuracy assessment method I used and there is no need for it in this research paper. Here the research methodology is simplified and corrected. 4) Thank you, some of the repetitive aspects of the study have been reduced. And the graphs have also been cut and simplified.

	perspective of the result of the study and also important to indicate the Limitation of the Study so that future research can also use this as a basis for their study. 6) Reference, the author(s) need to revise. 7. In general, the study has a promising result, and the author(s) must follow the recommendations to make it appeal more to the readers. It is highly recommended to submit this paper for grammar checks and be reviewed by a native English speaker.	5) Thank you, the mentioned comment is addressed as far as I know. 6) Thank you for your comment, the comment is mentioned comment is resolved in the revised manuscript. 7) Thank you, grammatical errors have been addressed in the appropriate fields.
Minor REVISION comments	Modify maps	Thank you, the mentioned comments are addressed in the revised manuscript.
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	