



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_22037
Title of the Manuscript:	Land Cover Classification Schemes Using Remote Sensing Images: A Recent Survey
Type of the Article	Review 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The attempts by authors of the paper are very praiseworthy. The paper is well constructed and informative but the focal theme of the present paper is too common and a wide range of work regarding this theme has previously done in several times.	Thank you for your valuable comments.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. There is no need to incorporate the points into abstract portion. 2. All the Figures of the paper should be better in terms of their resolution. 3. The paper should be represents in little bit detailed manner. 4. Some of the portions (Introduction, Paragraph2.3) of the paper are not written in good english which could not express the proper meaning of the focal theme to the global audience. 5. Ground truth verification is a major part of the LULC classification approach. It would be better if there is include a point "Ground truth verification" into the paper. 6. The concluding part of the paper could not point out the concrete and logical decision regarding the LULC classification approach. This portion should be more elaborate and objective specific.	The suggestion is well taken care of and the abstract is revised. The figures are redrawn and the resolution is improved. The paper is revised and explanation is provided in a detail. The corresponding language is improved The comment is taken care of. The conclusion is revised and a concrete and logical decision, regarding the LULC classification approaches, that hybrid approaches of combining multiple classification schemes has been found to be helpful for



SDI Review Form 1.6

		improvement of classification accuracy which is based on the type of image obtained from remote sensors (multispectral image, superspectral image or hyperspectral image) and the application area, is been arrived at.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The present paper seem to me as a collection of some literature rather than a research paper because there is no such empirical results which can be able to give some lights in connection with LULC classification approach with modern error free or less error technique.	The paper is completely restructured and the suggestion is considered.