

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research and Reviews in Physics |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJR2P_106552 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Modeling Total Suspended Solid (TSS) And Distribution Of Heavy Metal Pb Using Sentinel-2A |
| Type of the Article | Method Article |

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is important, can be useful after a major revision. 2. It is not suitable, recommending "Integration of Sentinel-2A Imagery and Laboratory Measurements for Estuarine Pb and TSS Concentration Monitoring in Suwung, Denpasar City, Indonesia". 3. It is not comprehensive, the abstract needs to be better structured. 4. The article needs to be structured correctly; the paper should be extended and vividly written. 5. I did not have data access, but the used method "correlation and regression" scientifically correct. 6. References are not sufficient. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <p>English needs to be better for scholarly communications.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>It was an interesting draft to review; it develops the correlation between field data and remote sensing for pb and TSS, and it has the potential to support monitoring, but after reviewing it, I concluded that it is more seemingly a minimal project work at this point rather than an analytical method article. Many criteria of the method article still need to be fulfilled. It should address the following to make it a better article.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the implications of this work, or what is the benefit of developing a regression equation between remote sensing data and laboratory data? This needs to be highlighted in the paper. 2. How the spatial distribution maps were predicted: I can see a map showing continuous surface, but which methods were used to generate these maps? 3. The paper mentioned monitoring water quality; why other water quality parameters are discarded? "Total Suspended Solid (TSS) and (Pb) can be used as indicators of the level of sedimentation and pollution, which is often the main problem for reservoirs (river estuaries) in Indonesia in providing clean water." What are the references for this line? These must be described in detail in the paper. 4. What about the water quality status after testing? how was water quality classified, Was there any classification guideline or method? 5. How were the primary samples collected? Can you detail the procedure of the primary water sample collection? 6. Could you identify the points in the maps where the primary samples were collected? <p>Overall remarks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate title, inadequate methodology, needing more literature review. • The paper should be extended and vividly written. It requires significant revision, i.e., appropriate title, structured research methodology, discussion, and proper conclusion | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | specifying the benefit of the outcomes. English needs to be better; the article needs to be structured correctly; the abstract also needs to be better structured; there is no literature review part, though it could be small for a method article, but this must be extended. At this point, this paper is not in the state of being published in a journal as a research article. All these concerns are to be addressed before proceeding. It is recommended that it must be revised and reviewed afterward. | |
|--|--|--|

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(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)</i> |
|---|--|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name: | Khandaker Iftekharul Islam |
| Department, University & Country | New Mexico State University, USA |