

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_102580
Title of the Manuscript:	Dust outbreaks across East Iran: Application of multi-source remote sensing data (AMSR-E and FengYun3-MWRI) on the effects of soil moisture
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:

(<https://www.journalgeesi.com/index.php/JGEESI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for the scientific community, since the problem of dust intrusions (dust storms and dust haze) associated with the deterioration of air quality significantly affects the ecosystems of various countries, especially those located in the dust belt.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is quite suitable for the issues related to the work.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is exhaustive, which corresponds to the content of the article</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript and subdivisions is built correctly.</p> <p>5. I believe that from a scientific point of view, the article deals with topical issues</p> <p>6. The number of links is sufficient and fresh.</p> <p>At the end of the article, it is necessary to provide specific recommendations for the scientific community on the use of those databases that have high accuracy.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>1. I have noted in some places of the manuscript that it is necessary to put references if possible.</p> <p>2. In table 5, lines 3 and 4 are not clear. If Fig.10. built according to line 1 and 4 of table 5, then it needs to be drawn up carefully.</p> <p>3. Authors' statement "Evidence presented above (Fig. 10) indicates dry soil (humidity near zero) has the highest dust production rate of 168.66 mg/m3. This amount is more than 1000 times the standard human standard (150 mg/m3) . Needs revision</p> <p>4. How can explain the different correlation coefficient for one place in different years, reflected in tables 6 and 7?</p>	

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:	Sabur F. Abdullaev
Department, University & Country	S. U. Umarov Physical-Technical Institute, National Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan, Tajikistan