



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJAST_27242
Title of the Manuscript:	Vegetation Impact on the Morphodynamic Activity of the River Kapuas
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:

(<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		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	This manuscript mainly focus on the vegetation impact on the morphodynamic activity of the river Kapuas based on the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI) using Landsat images. However, there are some minor comments, which I hope would be useful to improve this paper. 1. Suggest referencing a map figure of the study river. 2. Author should provide the contribution or the aim of this paper in the "Introduction" Part, even the advantage of NDVI index ; 3. Morphodynamic Activity of the River have close relationship with sediment supply and discharge, if possible, I hope author add some hydrological data and analyze their relation with NDVI index. 4. Since this manuscript show Landsat images of 1991, 1994, 1995, 2001, 2004, 2005 and 2013. I think author should attempt to put riverbank line of different period into one Figure, may be good.	Thank you for your valuable comments. I have tried my level best to answer all of your comments. Hope these answer will help you to understand my research article. 1. Figure 2 & 3, both are showing the study river with reference. 2. Now the aimed is mentioned in the introduction part at line 80 which is colored. 3. This study was focusing only on the vegetation impact especially on the bank erosion and stability that's why hydrological parameters are not considered. 4. Please check the Annex document (a new document created for better explanation) where river bank of 1973 and 2013 are shown. From there you can see the bank migration from 1973 to 2013.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		