



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_47433
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of the Temporal Change in Carbon Stock of Muthupet Mangroves in Tamil Nadu Using Remote Sensing Techniques
Type of the 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>)

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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>In this paper authors have investigated the remote sensing images using the ERDAS and ArcGIS software and applied the NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index) to estimate the quantity of carbon sequestration capability for the Avicennia marina mangrove growing in the Muthupet region for the period 2000-2017. The formula proposed by Lai (2007) was used to calculate the carbon stock using geospatial techniques. The results show that the mangroves in Muthupet region has NDVI values between -0.671 and 0.398 in 2000, -0.93 and 0.621 in 2010 and -0.66 and 0.398 in 2017 ie, wetlands are an important ecological boon as it helps to control the impact of climate change in many different ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The study is interesting and manuscript is almost structured properly. Following amendments are needed- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Page 2: 2.MATERIALS AND METHODS is to be replaced as 2.MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY 3. Results and Discussion should be replaced as: 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 3. Conclusion should be replaced as: 4. CONCLUSION and also re-written points wise. 	All the corrections indicated have been carried out in the revised paper
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manuscript is interesting and structured properly. The manuscript is recommended for publication after incorporating above suggestion / 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)	