Review of: "Urban Green Infrastructure Planning for the Bangkok Metropolitan Region: An Empirical Study for Greenspace Expansion"

Alireza Sharifi[1]

1 Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I have carefully read this manuscript, and the overall layout is reasonable. The completion level of the manuscript is also relatively high, and the research ideas and result analysis have reference value. The overall quality of the manuscript has basically met the requirements for publication. However, there are still some flaws in the manuscript, which leads to many loopholes in the details of the manuscript as follows:

1. Abstract should be rewritten, and some important numerical findings should be provided.

2. The number of keywords in the manuscript is too small to fully cover the main research content of the article.

3. The authors should clearly state the objectives of the study, including the specific goals of the proposed method and the analysis of the model's performance. This will help readers understand the purpose of the research.

4. A deep literature review should be given, particularly regarding state-of-the-art models. Therefore, the reviewer strongly suggests discussing and analyzing some advanced and latest works:

10.1007/s12524-019-01057-8

10.1109/JSTARS.2023.3242310

10.1109/JSTARS.2022.3223423

10.1109/JSTARS.2023.3237380

10.1007/s12524-021-01382-x

10.1080/2150704X.2022.2120780

5. Authors should provide the reasons for choosing the proposed algorithm.

6. What special information do you want to convey through Table I?

7. The tables should be analyzed more qualitatively in the Results and Discussion section.

8. The setting of the current experimental results section is somewhat unreasonable. The algorithms involved in the comparison in the current manuscript are all basic algorithms, and the comparison between the author's research results and them is not significant. It is recommended that the author include the latest research results in the comparison, so as to analyze the differences with the current latest results.

9. The experiments should be given more to show the effectiveness of the proposed method.

10. What have been the limitations of your work?

11. The conclusion of this paper still provides a lot of background information, which obviously does not meet the requirements of conclusion writing. In addition, this article did not explain the shortcomings of the experimental section

and the direction of future research.