SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JGEESI_47406**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Land Use and Land Cover Changes and its Impact on the Flood Plain of Bhagirathi River; A Case Study of Eastern part of Purba Bardhaman District**
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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**TOPIC: The topic is too ambiguous and lengthy. Consider revising to read: The Impact of Land use and Land Cover on the Flood Plain of Bhagirathi River, Purba Bardhaman District, India.** **ABSTRACT: The abstract is too loose coupled with poor tenses, grammars, and lack of coherent etc. T**he entire abstract should be rewritten to capture the main idea, summary of method, major findings, and conclusion. Introduction and Literature Review: The introduction is fair but literature review required total modifications and careful correction. The used of highlight, symbols, title of the other researchers in the introduction is unscientific and unacceptable. Some works cited in the introduction and literature review sections are not referenced. This is a serious criminal offence (plagiarism). E.g. Thurnbury, Schummm, Snow etc.. The Referencing format is not science domain standard compliance. The Method: The method is poorly presented. It is lack focused, and direction. The results are not adequately discussed and communicated **There are too many flaws in this manuscript. The author(s) take their time to revised and rewrite this manuscript** The referencing style is not standard compliances with the Vancouver which the Science Domain and Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International http://sciencedomain.org/archives/27	
Minor REVISION comments	It is difficult to differentiate this manuscript with a power point.	
Optional/General comments	The author(s) the information to give but they do not know how to communicate. Considering the numerous flaws, suggest that this manuscript be send to the author for thorough revision.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Umo, Ikpong Sunday***
Department, University & Country	***Aivan Ikoku Federal College Of Education, Nigeria***