

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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|---|--|--|
| 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. | This manuscript is highly valuable to the scientific community because it demonstrates an innovative application of IoT technology for disaster mitigation in a coastal area vulnerable to tidal flooding. By integrating sensors and real-time data processing, the study provides a practical solution that can help reduce the risks and impacts of flooding on the Tambaklorok community. The manuscript is especially commendable for its comprehensive approach, combining technological innovation with community outreach, such as mangrove planting, to strengthen local resilience against disasters. The successful implementation and positive outcomes highlight the potential of IoT-based systems in mitigating natural hazards in similar coastal regions worldwide. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Yes. | |
| 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. | Yes. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Yes. | |
| 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. | | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | No. The list of bibliographic references should be increased to approximately 40 references. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sergio-Lousada | |

Review Form 3

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>Yes.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The manuscript holds significant relevance for the subject, making its content highly valuable to researchers and readers interested in this field. The authors have meticulously crafted an excellent methodological description and the schematics (figures) that, while beneficial, need quality enhancement. These elements significantly aid in understanding the methodology and guidelines presented. The manuscript title accurately reflects its content, ensuring coherence and clarity.</p> <p>The carefully chosen keywords facilitate subsequent research and serialization (Rephrase alphabetically the keywords), allowing for efficient information retrieval. To further enhance the manuscript's presentation, a thorough rectification of its formatting is necessary. This includes eliminating blank spaces, ensuring proper alignment, and adhering to the editor's template. Such attention to detail will improve the overall readability and professionalism of the document.</p> <p>Despite its strengths, additional reviews are essential to elevate the manuscript's scientific rigor and quality. Implementing the corrections suggested by the reviewer is crucial. These amendments will refine the manuscript's content, making it more robust and authoritative. By addressing these recommendations, the manuscript will not only meet but exceed academic standards, ultimately contributing significantly to the body of knowledge in this domain. The conclusions are too weak. How they are now I cannot see how it contributes to the advance of the thematic field. In this regard, other researches and studies should be exposed, confronted/compared to create a discussion in order to enrich the state-of-the-art and consequently further develop the field, at least 3 paragraphs of text corroborating and comparing with similar works. The list of bibliographic references should be increased to approximately 40 references.</p> <p>In summary, the manuscript is well-constructed and relevant, but with further refinement and adherence to reviewer suggestions, it will achieve a higher level of excellence and scientific merit.</p> <p>If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me; I will be entirely available. I recommend reading the manuscript execution template provided by the publisher.</p> | |

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Sérgio António Neves Lousada</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>University of Madeira, Portugal</p> |