Review of: "Exploring the Impact of Future Land Uses on Flood Risks and Ecosystem Services, With Limited Data: Coupling a Cellular Automata Markov (CAM) Model, With Hydraulic and Spatial Valuation Models"

Mukul Kumar Sahu[1]

1 National Institute of Technology Karnataka

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. The abstract does not contain details regarding the years of Landsat images taken for making the future land cover, and the results section is theoretical instead of providing the percent change of land cover and the extent to which the land cover is affected. Also, the 'lost' value can reach 1.5 million USD in 2051; source of this. Overall, the abstract does not give complete details of the manuscript.
2. In the Keywords, a few words are given in full form and a few words are only abbreviations. Make continuity, and also, HEC-HMS is not mentioned in the abstract.
3. Markov chain models rely on the assumption that future land cover depends on the current state (base year map) and is independent of past states. (Sources).
4. Check the citations.
5. The Introduction section needs to be refined. Add more literature; no studies related to HEC-RAS are mentioned, and also the flow does not match from one paragraph to another.
6. The study area map is missing. Data used is not mentioned. Figures are not clear, and also the technique used is not mentioned, and the images used for making LULC.
7. Flowchart of the methodology used for the study. The Methodology section is not well structured, and also, proper abbreviations are not given. For example, with tools such as ArcHydro (ESRI, 2014) or GeoHEC-HMS (HEC, 2023). However, the recent versions of HEC-HMS and HEC-RAS (HEC, 2022) provide GIS tools for doing such analyses within the software. Which version of HEC-HMS was used? Resolution of the DEM used is missing in the manuscript.
8. Results and discussion are not clear, and also how to verify the results. This section has to be reframed and modified, and also the conclusion section.

Overall, the objective of the paper is good, but the manuscript and results are not up to mark and need a lot of modification as there is no proper flow in the paper, and also the methodology is confusing.

Based on the concerns I have raised, I recommend against accepting this paper for publication.