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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the integration of GIS with multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) in Bangladesh. It also consolidates existing research, highlighting the methodologies employed and their effectiveness in various disciplines. By identifying gaps in the current literature, the manuscript paves the way for future research, fostering innovation and improved decision-making processes in study area and similar regions. Ultimately, it contributes to the broader understanding of how GIS and MCDA can enhance sustainable development and informed policy-making. | Thanks for your positive assessment toward the manuscript. |
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