

Editor's Comments:

It is suggested to serious correct the technical errors before publishing in the journal. Please find the following points to be consider for correction.

Table 1: The Raster Attributes for 1986 Results – not clear what is blue, green, red ??? if this is DN or surface reflectance authors should be mentioned. Unclassified “0” means what?

How only 4 defined classification is possible.....where is unclassified pixel, are you merged with which class???? or unclassified you classified in bare class?

Each data set's spatial and spectral and radiometric resolution is not mentioned.

Used data are same months/seasons? Accordingly your calcification will differ.

Where are the accuracy reports? What is the classification accuracy each class (e.g., kappa statistics)?

Abstract and few tables you have mentioned “bare surface” and few tables mentioned “bare soil”???? Which is correct?

Fig. 4 legend shows “bare sueface”...it supposed to be bare surface

Cross matrix table is missing??? How readers knows that which class converted to which class??? e.g., vegetation class converted into build-up.

What is maximum likely-wood classification.

In study area section authors are mentioned lat/long but it is not clear whether it is north or south or east or west????

Rate of change in vegetation and water body is too high.....please check.

Authors may check and city following paper, which is more relevant to this study and would be useful for detailed understanding.

Comment [PKU1]: Those were pixel values in RGB adopted in signature class for image classification, However it has been expunged in the table

Comment [PKU2]: Means that there was no cover in the image that was not classified even as the unclassified has been removed because it has no value.

Comment [PKU3]: Unclassified was zero, so there is no need to represent it in the legend

Comment [PKU4]: It was mentioned in the manuscript see line 101

Comment [DI5]: the season has been indicated

Comment [PKU6]: I think its tautology flooding the MS with error matrix and percentage accuracy table since both solve the same problem

Comment [PKU7]: They mean same, however I have changed it to Bare soil

Comment [PKU8]: Yes it has been corrected to bare soil

Comment [PKU9]: The table for error matrix is same as cross matrix

Comment [PKU10]: This is supposed to be Maximum likelihood classification.

Comment [PKU11]: We have amended it

Comment [PKU12]: Please see table 7 & 8

Sivakumar, V. (2014). Urban Mapping and Growth Prediction using Remote Sensing and GIS Techniques, Pune, India. *The International Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences*, 40(8), 967. <http://www.int-arch-photogramm-remote-sens-spatial-inf-sci.net/XL-8/967/2014/isprsarchives-XL-8-967-2014.pdf>

Reference should be formatted as per the journal standard. It is severely lacking. Each reference has its own format.

English language correction is recommended to this manuscript.

Author's Feedback:

Please see the Author's feedback against the Editors comments above.