Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Journal of Geography, Environment and Earth Science International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JGEESI_123145**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Iot-Based Early Warning And Mitigation System For Rob Flood Detection In Sea Waters At Kampung Iklim, Tambak Lorok Village, Semarang**
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**Author's Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The article addresses the problem of Flood detection in seawater at Kampung Iklm. For early detection to avoid the hazardous condition, the article proposed the system with the integration of a remote device configured to determine the water surface level reading and provides a customizable alert system that notifies users about abnormal conditions or significant events Notifications involve sending alerts through various channels. Whereas, the workings of the proposed system are not explained in detail, thus the flow of the execution is unclear.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**An IoT-based mitigation system for early detection of flood at Kampung Ikim region**	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	**The limitations of existing systems are requested to be incorporated in the abstract, that clarifies the intention of the proposed article, and how the problems of the existing systems are overcome by the proposed article.**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**The section and subsection can be revised. The structure can include** • **Introduction (Introduction related to the proposed system)** • **Review literature (Review literature of the existing system with their limitations and scope of improvement)** • **Proposed methodology (Working of the proposed system with a detailed description)** • **Results (generated results related to the data capturing, connection establishment, monitoring dashboard etc.)** • **Comparative analysis (includes the comparison of the proposed system with existing systems based on the parameters and/or accuracy and/or comparative parameters)** • **Advantages** • **Conclusion**	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**The problem addressed by the author for early detection and flood disasters in Tambak Lorok Village in Semarang City. For early detection, the author proposed a system to determine the early detection of the flood by using the sensors and remote communication to the server for providing alerts. The detailed description provided in the article is too vague, thus it is unclear the working of the system.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**References can be in chronological order. Author requested to incorporate additional references that are related to the system/devices used for the early detection of floods, Also suggest incorporating the publish patents that are based on the early detection of floods which gives a clear idea and able to define scope of the proposed article.**	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The article's language is poor and needs to be revised to meet the standard of the international article. The author suggests checking the antecedence and spelling in the article.	
Optional/General comments	• The detailed description of Figure 1 is required to define the scope of the system. • The author suggested incorporating the 3-tier architecture for the system to define the work of the system and the loop of the system will be closed properly. • The author suggested providing the labeling for all figures and a detailed explanation of each figure to clear the scope of the system. • The author suggested adding figures for alert notifications. The figure 1 does not clear the following : • The author mentioned the sensors for wind speed, temperature, sea level, and wind direction, but in the pseudo-code, only water level data was disclosed. • Where the sensors are located and how these sensors are able to transmit sensor data is not clear. • How the sensors and system establish the connection is not clear; • How the server is able to receive the sensor data handle the sensor data and store data is not clear. • How the alert message is triggered and communicated to devices is not clear. • How the alert message is composed and transmitted to whom is not clear. • How the threshold value be checked for determining early flood detection is not clear. • The output for the alert SMS or email can be included in the result section.	

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:	**Rahul Diwate**
Department, University & Country	**India**