Electronic Supplementary Material 1. Anatomy of a plagiarized review.

The table includes exact, chronological quotes of one (entire) peer review report. The review text is divided into several pieces (rows) and analysed in terms of similarity to other reviews available online, based on Google search.

Review quote	Evidence of similarity to other published reviews	Comments
Reviewer #3: - The manuscript needs minor language, grammar and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker. - More suitable title should be selected for the article.	 mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Preparation and Performance Study of Radiation-Proof Ultra ...** The manuscript needs language, grammar, and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker. https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Comparison of Dynamic Vibration Control Techniques ... - MDPI** The manuscript needs language, grammar, and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker. https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Base Modified Biochar on Chlortetracycline Adsorption ... - MDPI** The manuscript needs language, grammar and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker. nih.gov https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov › pmc · Tłumaczenie strony **Relationship between anxiety and internet searches ... - NCBI** M Meira · 2022 — **The manuscript needs language, grammar, and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker** (Writing quality... https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov › pmc · Tłumaczenie strony **Impact of built environment on residential online car-hailing trips** Y Cao · 2022 · Cytowane przez 1 — **The manuscript needs language, grammar, and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English**...	The last sentence alone returns 100 hits, but this is perhaps too short and common phrase to be considered plagiarism. The first two sentences lead to **five** different sources after removal of the term "minor". Reviews of three articles published in different MDPI journals and two in PLOS journal. All five reviews were eponymous and signed by three different individuals.

- More explanation is needed for where there is a research gap and what the goals of the research are. The research gap and the goals of the research are not explained in detail which leads to the reader missing the significance of the research.	mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Structural Assessment Techniques for In-Service Crossarms in ...** More explanation is needed for where there is a research gap and what the research are. The research gap and the goals of the research are not ... https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Efficient Management and Scheduling of Massive Remote ...** Comment 2: More explanation is needed for where there is a research gap and what the goals of the research are. The research gap and the goals of the research ... https://www.mdpi.com › review_r... · Tłumaczenie strony **Sensitivity of Empirical Equation Parameters for the ... - MDPI** More explanation is needed for where there is a research gap and what the goals of the research are. The research gap and the goals of the research are not ... https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Dynamic Compressive Mechanical Properties of UR50 Ultra ...** More explanation is needed for where there is a research gap and what the goals of the research are. The research gap and the goals of the research are not ...	Exact repetition of two consecutive phrases from **four** reviews of different articles published in MDPI journals. Three reviews were eponymous and signed by different researchers. One review was anonymous.
- The introduction section is detailed, but needs a significant amount of reorganization. It could be strengthened by adding more recent references.	mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Supply Chain Management and Big Data Concept Effects on ...** 4 gru 2021 — The introduction section is detailed, but needs a significant amount of reorganization. It could be strengthened by adding more recent ... https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Identifying Spatial Driving Factors of Energy and Water ... - MDPI** The introduction section is detailed, but needs a significant amount of reorganization. It could be strengthened by adding more recent references. https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Vegetation Drought Vulnerability Mapping Using a Copula ...** The introduction section is detailed, but needs a significant amount of reorganization. It could be strengthened by adding more recent references. https://www.mdpi.com › review_r... · Tłumaczenie strony **Compensation for Marine Ecological Damage: From &lsquo** The introduction section is detailed, but needs a significant amount of reorganization. It could be strengthened by adding more recent references.	Exact repetition of two consecutive phrases from **four** reviews of different articles published three different MDPI journals. All four reviews were anonymous so the identity of reviewers is not known.

- Aside from the aim stated in the title, the research gap and the goals of the research are not specified which leads to the reader missing the significance of the research.		Exact repetition of one long phrase from **seven** reviews of articles published in five different MDPI journals and one PLOS journal. Five reviews were eponymous (signed by 4 different individuals) and two anonymous.
- A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology. - Following, you will find a new related reference which should be added to literature	Partial evidence	The first sentence alone returns 10 hits, but perhaps not all cases were intentional plagiarism cases.

review: Suwarno et al. IoT-based Lava Flood Early Warning System with Rainfall Intensity Monitoring and Disaster Communication Technology.		
- Discussion; * Improve the discussion section to better ascertain what is unique / novel about your findings; * Explain in detail how the article contributes to new knowledge in the domain.	mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Identifying Spatial Driving Factors of Energy and Water ... - MDPI** Improve the discussion section to better ascertain what is unique / novel about your findings; Explain in detail how the article contributes to new ... https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Vegetation Drought Vulnerability Mapping Using a Copula ...** Improve the discussion section to better ascertain what is unique / novel about your findings. - Explain in detail how the article contributes to new ... qeios.com https://www.qeios.com › read · Tłumaczenie strony **Computer-Assisted Language Learning Tools for Punctuation ...** C Triantafyllidou · 2022 — Improve the discussion section to better ascertain what is unique/novel about your findings; Explain in detail how the article contributes to new...	Exact repetition of two consecutive phrases from reviews of **three** different articles: two published in different MDPI journals and one in Qeios journal. Both MDPI reviews were anonymous. Qeios review was eponymous.

- Conclusion; * Update the conclusion to include the newly formulated theoretical contributions; * Mention the limitations of the study and prospects for future research; * Summarize the key results in a compact form and re-emphasize their significance;	mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **A Scenario Simulation Study on the Impact of Urban ... - MDPI** This paper focuses on the effect of the urban expansion on terrestrial carbon storage in the Yangtze River Delta. Urban expansion is extracted from the 2000 and ... mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Potential of Computed Aided Facility Management for Urban ...** - The subject addressed is within the scope of the journal. - The abstract could become much better if it properly introduces the study from a research ... mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Study of Atmospheric Forcing Influence on Harbour Water ...** The paper presents a new and interesting tool to predict weather effects on currents and water levels in ports and the presented case studies cover different ... mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Short-Crested Wave–Current Forces on a Concentric System ...** The article is devoted to the diffraction of the sea surface short-crested wave waves and uniform current on a concentric structure comprising an arc exterior ... mdpi.com https://www.mdpi.com › review_re... · Tłumaczenie strony **Identifying Spatial Driving Factors of Energy and Water ... - MDPI** Update the conclusion to include the newly formulated theoretical contributions; Mention the limitations of the study and prospects for future research. Ta strona była przez Ciebie odwiedzana 2 razy. Ostatnia wizyta: 05.07.23 unram.ac.id http://eprints.unram.ac.id › ... PDF **M [ESJ] Proofreading (Article #2022 x** IW Karta · 2022 — Dear Dr. Karta, I would ask you to check the pre-publication format of your article in Emerging Science Journal and modify some queries that ...	Exact repetition of three consecutive phrases from reviews of **six** different articles: five published in different MDPI journals and one in Emerging Science Journal. Four MDPI reviews and ECS review were anonymous and one MDPI review was eponymous.
* Summarize how the article contributes to new knowledge in the domain.	Partial evidence	The sentence returns 3 hits, but perhaps not all cases were intentional plagiarism cases

Electronic Supplementary Material 2. List of 40 identified, plagiarised reviews.

All reviews listed below contain the entire quote or a significant part of the quote, or a slightly modified (e.g. the word "major" replaced by "principal") version of the quote:

"The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument."

All searches were made in the Google search engine (an option of repeating the search with the omitted results was used). Review reports numbered from 1 to 25 are a result of the following search:

"The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument."

Review reports numbered from 26 to 30 are a result of the following search:

"The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session."

Review reports numbered from 31 to 43 are a result of the following search:

"Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript."

Review reports numbered from 44 to 44 are a result of the following search:

"I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument"

Review reports numbered from 45 to 50 are a result of the following search:

"defect of this study is the debate or Argument"

In the list below we included links to review reports published alongside papers, screenshots of the title page, the identified review text copied from the website with detected quotes highlighted in yellow.

1. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/15/12/2213/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

Comment 1: The subject addressed is within the scope of the journal.

Comment 2: To what extent can the results of this study be generalized to other rivers in other parts of the world?

Comment 3: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 4: More suitable title should be selected for the table 2 instead of "Summaries of selected site characteristics illustrate differences in catchment, valley, instream….."

Comment 5: Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.
a. How the study was designed?
b. How the study was carried out?
c. How the data were analyzed?

Comment 6: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 7: It is suggested to add articles entitled "Nama et al. Field and Satellite Images-Based Investigation of Rivers Morphological Aspects" and "Agashua et al. Modeling the Semivariogram of Climatic Scenario around Rivers by Using Stream Network Mapping and Hydrological Indicator" to the literature review.

Comment 8: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

Comment 9: The discussion section needs to be described scientifically. Kindly frame it along the following lines:

i. Main findings of the present study
ii. Comparison with other studies
iii. Implication and explanation of findings
iv. Strengths and limitations
v. Conclusion, recommendation, and future direction.

2. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/13/1/283/review_report

Reviewer 1 Report

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- Page 8: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"When a metaheuristic algorithm enhances a problem with the best solution, the initial solution is usually randomly generated [52]. The optimisation process will end when the optimal solution is near the random guess and fast convergence. The optimisation process will take a lot of time when the optimal solution is far from random guesses, and convergence will be slower."

- More explanations should be presented regarding figure 5. It is unclear.

- The quality of figure 6 is not acceptable. I would ask you to use the original source of this figure.

- Please modify the equations numbers. There is two Eq. 5. Also, there is a Chinese sign in equation 5, which should be modified.

- Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.
a. How the study was designed?
b. How the study was carried out?
c. How the data were analyzed?

-The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Surono et al. Optimization of Markov Weighted Fuzzy Time Series Forecasting Using Genetic Algorithm (GA) and Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)" and "Duong et al. PSO based Hybrid PID-FLC Sugeno Control for Excitation System of Large Synchronous Motor" to the literature review.

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- More suitable title should be selected for the figure 5 instead of "Sample points generated using Faure distribution.".

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

3. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9067/10/1/23/review_report

Reviewer 1 Report

This paper adds to the evidence that there are need for children's involvement in the health literacy research

There are a number of issues with the manuscript which that should be considered:

Abstract

·   Please provide further information about the study outcomes

·   In the abstract you need to answer the following questions, what, why and how and discuss the study new findings, limitations, and future research

·   The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone

Introduction

-      discuss the research aims, research gap and discuss the paper layout Add up-to-date references to support your discussion

-      The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction

-      The literature reviewed and cited is in the main rather old. There are about many recent researches published on this topic, please cite the following articles:

Methods

·   The methodology of this study should be detailed, limit information was provided on method and materials.

·   How the author could improve the internal and external validity of the study.

·   How the Author could generalize the study finding

Discussion

-      I believe that more in depth discussion is needed. The discussion as present now is simple and concise. Revision of more papers using similar technique is needed

-      In the discussion, please discuss if the study research questions are answered or not Also introduce the model in detail. Draw a conclusion from this study and present the limitations and future research.

-      . The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument

-      Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously.

-      Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session

-      Please provide the research implication (what this research add ?)

-    Study limitation should be added

    4.   https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/8/1241/review_report

Increased Water Abstraction and Climate Change Have Substantial Effect on Morphometry, Salinity, and Biotic Communities in Lakes: Examples from the Semi-Arid Burdur Basin (Turkey)

by Mehmet Arda Çolak [1,*] ✉, Barış Öztaş [2] ✉ iD, İbrahim Kaan Özgencil [3,4] ✉, Melisa Soyluer [3,4] ✉, Mustafa Korkmaz [3,5] ✉ iD, Arely Ramírez-García [3,6] ✉ iD, Melisa Metin [3] ✉, Gültekin Yılmaz [5] ✉, Serhat Ertuğrul [5] ✉, Ülkü Nihan Tavşanoğlu [7] ✉ iD, Cihelio Alves Amorim [3] ✉ iD, Can Özen [8] ✉, Meral Apaydın Yağcı [9] ✉ iD, Abdulkadir Yağcı [9] ✉ iD, Juan Pablo Pacheco [10] ✉ iD, Korhan Özkan [5,8] ✉, Meryem Beklioğlu [3,8] ✉, Erik Jeppesen [3,5,8,11,12] ✉ iD and Zuhal Akyürek [1,2,8] ✉ iD

Reviewer 4 Report

Comment 1: The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

Comment 2: Explain the reason for choosing Burdur catchment area in the research method.

Comment 3: The selected area is very limited. How far can the results obtained for this area be generalized to the entire basin?

Comment 4: Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section. How the study was designed?How the study was carried out?How the data were analyzed?

Comment 5: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 6: It is suggested to add articles entitled "Krisnayanti et al. Curve Number Estimation for Ungauged Watershed in Semi-Arid Region; Sampson et al. Sensations of Air Temperature Variability and Mitigation Strategies in Urban Environments; Sertac Oruc, Non-stationary Investigation of Extreme Rainfall" to the literature review.

Comment 7: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 8: Please explain your results into steps and links to your proposed method.

Comment 9: I would like to request the author to emphasis on the contributions on practically and academically in implication session.

Comment 10: The authors should add a flowchart of the methodology.

Comment 11: Page 6. The ratio between climate model results and observations was multiplied by the model's raw values to get bias-ad- justed precipitation values for the historical, validation, and prediction periods.. What are the other feasible alternatives? What are the advantages of adopting these configurations over others in this case? How will this affect the results? More details should be furnished.

Comment 10: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

5. https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/13/9/5288/review_report

Reviewer 3 Report

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- Page 6: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"A.exigua, N. menisculus, and N. viridula are distributed in the negative position of axis 2. A. exigua is more common in eutrophic polluted waters [50]. N. menisculus is commonly found in freshwaters such as swamps, lakes, and rivers and endures organic pollution with high tolerance to inorganic eutrophication [51]. N. viridula exists in waters with high nitrogen and phosphorus [40] and occurs in eutrophic rivers in China [52]."

- The quality of figure 1 is not acceptable. I would ask you to use the original source of figure 1.

- All symbols and parameters should be defined, please check.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Abujraiban & Assaf. Effect of Strategic Planning of Human Resources in Management Performance" and "J. Carvalho. Modelling (Social) Intra/Entrepreneurship Process" to the literature review.

- More suitable title should be selected for the figure 5 instead of "pH value and eutrophication curves compared with the measured data in Yilong…..".

- Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.

a. How the study was designed?

b. How the study was carried out?

c. How the data were analyzed?

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

6. https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1312/11/4/868/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- The quality of figures 1 to 5 is not acceptable. I would ask you to use the original source of these figures.

- All symbols and parameters should be defined, please check.

- Page 7: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"The field data shows that response of Molikpaq to dynamic ice load is different to lock-in vibration of lighthouse and jacket structures. The difference is that Molikpaq platform is a caisson on the sand core which creates large damping. The system is close to an over damped or critically damped system which returns to equilibrium position after unloading without oscillating. The inertia force of the platform caused small or even no negative displacement against the ice movement direction after unloading."

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Basack et al. Flow Characteristics through Granular Soil Influenced by Saline Water Intrusion: A Laboratory Investigation" and "G. Russo et al. Hybrid Energy Piles as a Smart and Sustainable Foundation" to the literature review.

- More suitable title should be selected for the table 1 instead of "Typical PLC conditions measurement on offshore structures.".

- Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.

a. How the study was designed?

b. How the study was carried out?

c. How the data were analyzed?

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

7. https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/10/6/218/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

I would suggest the author to apply these chapters to organize this paper. Chapter 1 Introduction; Chapter 2 Literature Review; Chapter 3 Method; Chapter 4 Results; Chapter 5 Implications ; Chapter 6 Conclusions; and References. In present version, I think this might confuse the readers.

The three main criteria for this manuscript are: (a) quality and content of the research/review; (b) Quality, brevity and clarity of presentation; (c) Significance, relevance and timeliness of the topic. In addition, this title is (i) coverage of the literature/significant developments in the field, or clarity of discussion within an emerging topic; (ii) originality, new perspectives or insights; (iii) international interest; and (iv) relevance for governance, policy or practical perspectives relevant to the focus of this manuscript. However, this study is lacking most of important criteria. Hence, I think the author needs to consider these criteria before your submission.

Please make sure that a competent editor checks the English. Use of the first person ("I", "we", etc.) and third person ("he", "she" etc)must be avoided.

To be legible, the whole text must be completely edited with the help of a native English editor to polish your writing to prevent redundancies, grammatical errors and punctuation problems.

The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

The **literature review is necessar**y for you to clarify the "contribution" of your study. In current form, there is none literatures to support your study. The author failed to present the study debates and failed to discuss the debates. In general, the author should present the specific debate for your study.

Mathematical formulation is logically and clearly presented. In addition, the case and associated data analysis are illustrative to demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed method.

I would like to request the author to emphasis on the contributions on practically and academically in implication section.

Please make sure your **conclusions' section underscore** the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the **applicability of your findings/results**, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

8. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/10/5892/review_report

Totally the present article is not well-established, but the subject is quite interesting.Therefore, there is still room for narrative, argumentative, and verification improvements, prior it to be accepted for publication.

1. Keywords: It is good if authors improve them. The function of keywords is to supplement the information given in the title. Words in the title are automatically included in indexes, and keywords serve as additional pointers.
2. The highlight points have to be accompanied by numerical data or quantitative information, to support the outcomes yielded. The sole notation of expressions like: acceptable, improved, well-established, can meet the necessity for, they have to be quantified.
3. The manuscript needs language, grammar and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker. Grammar and syntax of narrative can be checked and smoothened, accordingly.
4. More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.
5. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.This section isn't clear. Authors just collecting some ideas. Please, try to improve this section by highlighting the research gape and the novelty of this work. Also, try to lead the author smoothly to your point.
6. It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.
7. The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.
8. The text content of the Introduction section can be reorganized into two or three paragraphs.
9. The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.
10. Please avoid reference overkill/run-on, i.e. do not use more than 3 references per sentence.
11. A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.Authors followed a scientific and acceptable approaches; however, they fail in presenting their steps in a clear way. I recommend a second look to this section and deleting unnecessary details.
12. It is important to cite all equations into the main text.

13. It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.
14. Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.
15. The Results and Discussion section is devoted, in large, by representing the research outcomes' yielded, but a critical and integrated approach of these outcomes has been made, probable at a distinct "synthesis' and cross-cited subsection. In this distinct subsection the key-aspects that determine the outcomes have to be signified into a descriptive manner.
16. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.
17. "Notation" should be added to the article.
18. The citing information at the References section is given in a messy way, since it seems that the Vol and No of issues is partially missing, while page range is noted either in "pp" or not. Therefore, unification of all citations has to be given, making them easily traceable by the readers. Moreover, literature refresh and enrichment with more and relevant to the topic published papers can be deployed.
19. Add some of the following references

---Das, S.K., Ghosh, G,K., Avasthe, R.K., Sinha, K., 2021. Compositional heterogeneity of different biochar: Effect of pyrolysis temperature and feedstocks. Journal of Environmental Management. 278 (2): 111501. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111501

---Das, S.K., Ghosh, G,K., Avasthe, R.K., Sinha, K., 2020. Morpho-mineralogical exploration of crop, weed and tree derived biochar. Journal of Hazardous Materials. 124370. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2020.124370

9. https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/14/18/4612/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

This paper conducts a methodological comparison study of water extraction in the Tibetan Plateau region for the newly launched Landsat9 satellite data, which is significant for enriching the data of lake changes in the Tibetan Plateau region and exploring climate change and ecological environmental protection in the Tibetan Plateau. Compared to Landsat-8, satellite sensor in Landsat-9 has some improvements but still has some similarities in design. In this study, only the accuracy of nine models for extracting water bodies in Landsat9 images was investigated, and the performance was not compared with that of Landsat8 images.

Moreover, in the results of the study, although the extraction accuracy of each model is illustrated, the comparative analysis of the model's time consumption and resource usage is not performed, which cannot fully reflect the advantages that machine learning methods such as SVM and RF have over water body index models such as NDWI in water body extraction. The study is generally

innovative, and it is recommended to add the necessary comparative analysis of model time consumption and resource usage.

In models such as the water body index method, the authors manually adjust the thresholds based on lake sample point data (L312) So, why not use the zonal automatic threshold determination method? Although the authors made certain explanations, such as the lake area of the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau accounts for a relatively small area compared to the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau as a whole, which affects the use of automatic extraction methods such as OSTU. However, a large number of studies have now shown that the thresholds are different in different regions, and the authors can use zoning to automatically determine the thresholds to start the study and reduce human errors.

In terms of result validation (Section 4.3), the authors used TPLA_V3 data as the true value for lake area data accuracy validation, which is inappropriate. The seasonal and interannual variability of lakes on the Tibetan plateau is significant, especially for small lakes.The authors used the lake interpretation results before 2021 as true values to verify the lake interpretation results in 2022, which obviously introduced unnecessary errors. It is suggested that the authors decode the February-April 2022 lake data of Landsat9 or Landsat8 as the true values by manual decoding. Otherwise, the authors' current accuracy comparison is wrong.

<General Comments>

- More suitable title should be selected for the article.

- Abstract needs to modify: the abstract should contain Objectives, Methods/Analysis, Findings, and Novelty /Improvement.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

10. https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/19/21/14392/review_report

Reviewer 1 Report

Abstract

·   Please provide further information about the study outcomes

·   In the abstract you need to answer the following questions, what, why and how and discuss the study new findings, limitations, and future research

·   The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone

Introduction

-    discuss the research aims, research gap and discuss the paper layout Add up-to-date references to support your discussion

-    The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

Methods

·   How the authors treat the heterogeneous of the studies methodologies? Did the authors used random effect approaches ?

·   ·   **Discussion**

-    I believe that more in depth discussion is needed. The discussion as present now is simple and concise. Revision of more papers using similar technique is needed

-    In the discussion, please discuss if the study research questions are answered or not Also introduce the model in detail. Draw a conclusion from this study and present the limitations and future research.

-    . The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument

-    Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously.

-    Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

11. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0235780

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Reviewer #1: Totally the present article is well-established and the subject is interesting, but some major revision should be considered.

- More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

- Literature review is not enough. There some articles, which must be added to literature review:

Li & Leao. Application of Nor Sand Constitutive Model in a Highway Fill Embankment Slope Stability Failure Study;

Emeka et al. Deformation behaviour of erodible soil stabilized with cement and quarry dust.

- A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.

- The quality of figures 7 to 11 is weak. The original source of the figures should be used into the manuscript.

- A map should be presented for the study area. It is suggested to show the general location and then in 2 or 3 step show the exact location.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- I would suggest you to discuss regarding the supportvector machine method (you can use researches entitled "Application of Support Vector Machine and Gene Expression Programming on Tropospheric ozone Prognosticating for Tehran Metropolitan" and "A Modern Method to Improve of Detecting and Categorizing Mechanism for Micro Seismic Events Data Using Boost Learning System").

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- DOI of the references should be added (you can use "" ext-link-type="uri" xlink:type="simple">https://crossref.org/").

- "Notation" should be added to the article.

12. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0272950

A high-quality severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID) rat bioresource

Yoshiki Miyasaka, Jinxi Wang, Kosuke Hattori, Yuko Yamauchi, Miho Hoshi, Kazuto Yoshimi, Saeko Ishida, Tomoji Mashimo

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	August 23, 2021
Decision Letter - Bing He, Editor	29 Sep 2021
Revision 1	
Author Response	18 Mar 2022
Decision Letter - Bing He, Editor	29 Jul 2022
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Bing He, Editor	4 Aug 2022

Reviewer #1: - More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- More suitable title should be selected for the table 1 instead of "Blood biochemistry results.".

- Page 6: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"The Osaka University Animal Experiment Committee approved all the animal experiments (Permission number:24-006-042). The Il2rg/Rag dKO and Il2rg sKO-SCID rats were microbiologically tested by the Fujinomiya Technical Service Center (FTSC) of CLEA Japan, where they were also kept in an IVC system."

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Ehnert et al. Feasibility of Cell Lines for In Vitro Co-Cultures Models for Bone Metabolism", "Kosvyra et al. Developing an Integrated Genomic Profile for Cancer Patients with the Use of NGS Data" and "Abdul Abubakar et al. Generation of Open Metatarsal Fracture in Rats: A Model for Secondary Fracture Healing" to the literature review.

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use "" ext-link-type="uri" xlink:type="simple">https://crossref.org/").

13. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0247599

Investigation on cement-improved phyllite based on the vertical vibration compaction method

Yingjun Jiang [CO], Jiangtao Fan [CO] [✉], Yong Yi [✉], Tian Tian [✉], Kejia Yuan, Changqing Deng

Published: March 3, 2021 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0247599

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	December 24, 2020
Decision Letter - Ahmed Mancy Mosa, Editor	19 Jan 2021
Revision 1	
Author Response	26 Jan 2021
Decision Letter - Ahmed Mancy Mosa, Editor	5 Feb 2021
Revision 2	
Author Response	5 Feb 2021
Decision Letter - Ahmed Mancy Mosa, Editor	10 Feb 2021
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Ahmed Mancy Mosa, Editor	19 Feb 2021

Reviewer #1: - More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

- A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Arshid and Kamal. Appraisal of Bearing Capacity and Modulus of Subgrade Reaction of Refilled Soils" and "Fazelabdolabadi and Golestan. Towards Bayesian Quantification of Permeability in Micro-scale Porous Structures – The Database of Micro Networks" to the literature review.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- More suitable title should be selected for the figure 6 instead of "Comparison of maximum dry density between heavy compaction and VVCM tests".

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review:

Alzaim et al. Effect of Modulus of Bituminous Layers and Utilization of Capping Layer on Weak Pavement Subgrades;

Majeed et al. Evaluation of Concrete with Partial Replacement of Cement by Waste Marble Powder.

- Page 3: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"In the case of phyllite B and C, it was difficult to extract a complete rock sample on site owing to their high degree of weathering. Hence, only a point load strength test was performed for these samples. The point load test has no specific requirements on the shape of the specimen, and it does not require that the specimen must be a regular cylinder or cube."

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- "Notation" should be added to the article.

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use ""_ ext-link-type="uri" xlink:type="simple">https://crossref.org/").

    14. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0262610

High atherogenic risk concomitant with elevated HbA1c among persons with type 2 diabetes mellitus in North Ethiopia

Hagos Amare Gebreyesus 🔲, Girmatsion Fisseha Abreha, Sintayehu Degu Besherae, Merhawit Atsbha Abera, Abraha Hailu Weldegerima, Aregawi Haileslassie Gidey, Afework Mulugeta Bezabih, Tefera Belachew Lemma, Tsinuel Girma Nigatu

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission		May 27, 2021
Decision Letter - Xiao-Feng Yang, Editor		19 Jul 2021
Revision 1		
Author Response		7 Sep 2021
Decision Letter - Xiao-Feng Yang, Editor		31 Dec 2021
Formally Accepted		
Acceptance Letter - Xiao-Feng Yang, Editor		24 Jan 2022

Reviewer #1: - We prefer if you use the third person singular, instead of the first person singular or plural (e.g. "we").

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- More suitable title should be selected for the table 3 instead of "Distribution of metabolic syndrome (MetS) by sex, age, and glycemic status based on classification criteria (n=421).".

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "D. Serwaa et al. Prevalence and Determinant of Erectile Dysfunction in Type II Diabetes Mellitus and Healthy Men", "D. R. Paudel. Catastrophic Health Expenditure: An Experience from Health Insurance Program in Nepal" and "Phuoc-Tan Diep. Oxytocin May be Superior to Gliptins as a Potential Treatment for Diabetic COVID-19 Patients" to the literature review.

- Page 9: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"Permission was acquired from Tigray Regional Health Bureau and participating institutions (Adigrat and Mekelle General Hospitals). Each participant provided informed consent and voluntarily gave a blood sample. There was no significant harm in connection with the volume of blood collected and the collection process. Participants with panic results were immediately linked to their physician."

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- "Notation" should be added to the article.

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use "" ext-link-type="uri" xlink:type="simple">https://crossref.org/").

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

15. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0249311

Impact of agile management on project performance: Evidence from I.T sector of Pakistan

Umer Muhammad [icon], Tahira Nazir, Najam Muhammad, Ahsen Maqsoom, Samina Nawab, Syeda Tamkeen Fatima, Khuram Shafi, Faisal Shafique Butt

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	October 1, 2020
Decision Letter - Dejan Dragan, Editor	11 Nov 2020
Revision 1	
Author Response	26 Feb 2021
Decision Letter - Dejan Dragan, Editor	16 Mar 2021
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Dejan Dragan, Editor	25 Mar 2021

Reviewer #2: 1. The three main criteria for this manuscript are (a) quality and content of the research/review; (b) Quality, brevity and clarity of presentation; (c) Significance, relevance and timeliness of the topic. In addition, this title is (i) coverage of the literature/significant developments in the field or clarity of discussion within an emerging topic; (ii) originality, new perspectives or insights; (iii) international interest; and (iv) relevance for governance, policy or practical perspectives relevant to the focus of this manuscript. However, this study is lacking the most important criteria. Hence, I think the author needs to consider these criteria before your submission.

2 To be legible, the whole text must be completely edited with the help of a native English editor to polish your writing to prevent redundancies, grammatical errors and punctuation problems.

3. Please underscore the scientific value-added of your paper in your abstract and introduction.

4. Introduction should be clearly stated research questions and targets first. Then answer several questions: Why is the topic important (or why do you study on it)? What are the research questions? What has been studied? What are your contributions? Why is to propose this particular method? The outline of the paper can also be included. Please build upon the great work we have published on these subjects.

5. The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

6. The literature review is necessary for you to clarify the "contribution" of your study. In current form, there is none literature to support your study. The author failed to present the study debates and failed to discuss the debates. In general, the author should present a specific debate for your study.

7. In the Introduction and Literature review, the author conducts detailed literature discussions on agile management, but it would be better if the literature can be added in the last five years.

8. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscores the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part in more detail. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

16. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0271026

Environmental justice and power plant emissions in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative states

Juan Declet-Barreto, Andrew A. Rosenberg

Published: July 20, 2022 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0271026

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	September 7, 2021
Decision Letter - Hanna Landenmark, Editor	31 Jan 2022
Revision 1	
Author Response	4 Apr 2022
Decision Letter - Diane Sicotte, Editor	24 May 2022
Revision 2	
Author Response	15 Jun 2022
Decision Letter - Diane Sicotte, Editor	23 Jun 2022
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Diane Sicotte, Editor	27 Jun 2022

Reviewer #1: - More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- More suitable title should be selected for the figure 4 instead of "Demographics in k-means cluster analysis of Census Tracts hosting EGUs in RGGI.".

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Okeke et al. City as Habitat; Assembling the Fragile City", "Gibergans-Baguena et al. The Quality of Urban Air in Barcelona: A New Approach Applying Compositional Data Analysis Methods" and "Angelevska et al. Urban Air Quality Guidance Based on Measures Categorization in Road Transport" to the literature review.

- Page 11: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"In addition, others have voiced more fundamental problems with carbon trading that do not center on emissions reductions, namely that carbon markets enable commodification of air pollution (30), effectively giving polluting facilities private property rights over the atmosphere."

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use "" ext-link-type="uri" xlink:type="simple">https://crossref.org/").

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

17. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0254949

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review
					≫

Peer Review History

Original Submission	March 19, 2021
Decision Letter - Lubos Buzna, Editor	23 Apr 2021
Revision 1	
Author Response	23 May 2021
Decision Letter - Lubos Buzna, Editor	7 Jul 2021
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Lubos Buzna, Editor	23 Jul 2021

Reviewer #2: - More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- More suitable title should be selected for the table 3 instead of "Sample characteristic (n=934).".

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Guo et al. Weather Impact on Passenger Flow of Rail Transit Lines", "Habeeb and Talib Weli. Relationship of Smart Cities and Smart Tourism: An Overview" and "Abdulrazzaq et al. Traffic Congestion: Shift from Private Car to Public Transportation" to the literature review.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- Page 16: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"The third factor brings together the assessment of pedestrian crossings. Interestingly enough, all aspects of the crossings end up in the same factor: the waiting time, green light phases, traffic lights and safety aspects. In general, they are perceived rather poorly by the respondents – only 2% of respondents perceive pedestrian crossing waiting time as excellent."

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- "Notation" should be added to the article.

18. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0235780.r004

Susceptibility mapping and zoning of highway landslide disasters in China

Chao Yin, Haoran Li, Fa Che ✉, Ying Li, Zhinan Hu, Dong Liu

Published: September 4, 2020 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235780

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	February 18, 2020
Decision Letter - Claudionor Ribeiro da Silva, Editor	16 Apr 2020
Revision 1	
Author Response	26 May 2020
Decision Letter - Claudionor Ribeiro da Silva, Editor	23 Jun 2020
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Claudionor Ribeiro da Silva, Editor	25 Aug 2020

PONE-D-20-03927R1

Reviewer #1: Totally the present article is well-established and the subject is interesting, but some major revision should be considered.

- More suitable title should be selected for the article. Title should decrease to 10-12 words.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

- Literature review is not enough. There some articles, which must be added to literature review:

Li & Leao. Application of Nor Sand Constitutive Model in a Highway Fill Embankment Slope Stability Failure Study;

Emeka et al. Deformation behaviour of erodible soil stabilized with cement and quarry dust.

- A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.

- The quality of figures 7 to 11 is weak. The original source of the figures should be used into the manuscript.

- A map should be presented for the study area. It is suggested to show the general location and then in 2 or 3 step show the exact location.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- I would suggest you to discuss regarding the supportvector machine method (you can use researches entitled "Application of Support Vector Machine and Gene Expression Programming on Tropospheric ozone Prognosticating for Tehran Metropolitan" and "A Modern Method to Improve of Detecting and Categorizing Mechanism for Micro Seismic Events Data Using Boost Learning System").

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- DOI of the references should be added (you can use "" ext-link-type="uri" xlink:type="simple">https://crossref.org/").

22

- "Notation" should be added to the article.

Assessment of the Vulnerability of the Coast of Lake Alakol to Modern Geomorphological Processes of Relief Formation

by Akhmetkal Medeu [1], Adilet Valeyev [1,2,*], Farida Akiyanova [3], Yuisya Lyy [1], Gulnura Issanova [2,4] and Yongxiao Ge [5,6]

Reviewer 2 Report

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- In Figure 1, a suitable title should be provided for each image.

- What effects can the grading and type of materials have on the resultsin coastal areas?

- More suitable title should be selected for the table 1 instead of "Shore parameters and their vulnerability with corresponding conditions.".

- Using the article entitled " Safari Ghaleh et al. Numerical Modeling of Failure Mechanisms in Articulated Concrete Block Mattress as a Sustainable Coastal Protection Structure ", discuss regarding the coastal protection systems.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

-   Explain the reason for choosing this area as a case study?

- Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.

a. How the study was designed?

b. How the study was carried out?

c. How the data were analyzed?

-   All symbols and parameters should be defined, please check.

- Draw a flowchart from your workflow that briefly shows the process of the methodology.

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Page 10: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"Various exogenous processes are activated during shore formation. The leading relief-forming processes in different types of coastal relief were identified. On the flat denudational and accumulative types of relief occupying the western, northwestern, northern, and northeastern coasts, the under-flooding of the low shore areas, surge phenomena, soil salinization, and abrasion of the high shore areas prevails (Figure 3a). On the lakemarsh plain, with coastal aquatic vegetation, the dynamics of waterlogging ranged from 200 to 1,000 meters landward from 1990 to 2018 (Valeyev et al., 2019)."

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Asmal et al. The Impact of the Environment and People's Attitudes on Greywater Management in Slum Coastal Settlements" and "Sari et al. Land Procurement for Public Interest Against Destroyed Land: Natural Events and Legal Certainty" to the literature review.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

The manuscript needs minor language, grammar and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker.

20. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/5/789/review_report

Reviewer 1 Report

Comment 1: The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

Comment 2: More suitable title should be presented for the figure 3 instead of "Principal component eigenvalue and variance contribution rate and load matrix.".

Comment 3: Please underscore the scientific value added of your paper in your abstract and introduction.

Comment 4: Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.

1. How the study was designed?

2. How the study was carried out?

3. How the data were analyzed?

Comment 5: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 6: It is suggested to add articles entitled "Nazarnia et al. A Systematic Review of Civil and Environmental Infrastructures for Coastal Adaptation to Sea Level Rise" and "Emmy C. Kerich. Households Drinking Water Sources and Treatment Methods Options in a Regional Irrigation Scheme" to the literature review.

Comment 7: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 8: Please explain your results into steps and links to your proposed method.

Comment 9: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

Comment 10: I would like to request the author to emphasis on the contributions on practically and academically in implication session.

21. https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/15/2/507/review_report

Real-Time and Continuous Tracking of Total Phosphorus Using a Ground-Based Hyperspectral Proximal Sensing System

by Na Li [1,2], Yunlin Zhang [1,*] ✉ ⓘ, Kun Shi [1,3], Yibo Zhang [1], Xiao Sun [1,2], Weijia Wang [1,2], Haiming Qian [1,4], Huayin Yang [1,2] and Yongkang Niu [1]

Reviewer 3 Report

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- It is mentioned in p.4 that "After the samples were decomposed by alkaline potassium persulfate obeying the "Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater", the TN and TP were measured by a Shimadzu UV-2550 PC UV-Vis spectrophotometer [22,38]." What are other feasible alternatives? What are the advantages of adopting this particular approach over others in this case? How will this affect the results? The authors should provide more details on this.

- More explanations should be presented regarding figure 5. It is unclear.

- Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.

a. How the study was designed?

b. How the study was carried out?

c. How the data were analyzed?

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- More suitable title should be selected for the figure 3 instead of "Short-term series of TP variations in Lake Taihu (a), Liangxi River (b) a…...".

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Nkansah et al. Preliminary Studies on the Use of Sawdust and Peanut Shell Powder as Adsorbents for Phosphorus Removal from Water" and "Hussain & Al-Fatlawi. Remove Chemical Contaminants from Potable Water by Household Water Treatment System" to the literature review.

- Page 7: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"In addition, the retrieved TP was in good agreement with the measured TP, which is evenly distributed around the 1:1 line. Therefore, to reduce the estimation error as much as possible, the XGBoost model for TP estimation with the highest determination coefficient and low errors was selected, which indicated that the model could quantify the dynamics of TP with the satisfactory performance and good applicabilit."

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

22. https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1312/11/8/1545/review_report

Reviewer 3 Report

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- More suitable title should be selected for the figure 3 instead of "Installation drawing of turbine torque test device.".

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- Using the article entitled "Yamini et al. Hydraulic Performance of Seawater Intake System Using CFD Modeling", discuss regarding the formation of vortices at the entrance.

- It is mentioned that "The turbulence term of the RANS equation is simulated by the SST k-ω turbulence model, which has been widely used….". The authors should explain the reason for choosing the turbulence model in the numerical model?

- The material and method divisions are not well done and not explain the details of the work. It is better to give necessary and important information. The method of doing the work is not clear enough. Describe the year of the experiment, how the data was collected, and how the work was performed. Or make a flowchart of how to do it for the Materials and Methods section. The content of this section is not sufficient.

- Calibration and validation of the results should be given more attention by the authors.

- For the Fig. 15. Pressure contours of different slotted blades (TSR=3) Provide explanations and comparison of different conditions.

- All symbols and parameters should be defined, please check.

- Draw a flowchart from your workflow that briefly shows the process of the methodology.

- Page 10: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"The influence of the slot on the hydrofoil flow field depends to a large extent on its geometric parameters. As the slot's exit position gets closer to the transition point, its suppression of the flow separation of the hydrofoil becomes better. For example, when the exit position is at 0.35c, compared to the clear hydrofoil, the flow separation of the slotted hydrofoils is obviously suppressed. Similarly, as the slot exit width is larger, the hydrofoil flow separation suppression effect is better. This is because the more significant the exit width of the slot, the greater the fluid momentum injected into the hydrofoil suction surface from the hydrofoil pressure surface."

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Sazonov et al. Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) Simulation of Mesh Jet Devices for Promising Energy-Saving Technologies" and "Sazonov et al. Designing Mesh Turbomachinery with the Development of Euler's Ideas and Investigating Flow Distribution Characteristics" to the literature review.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

23. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/14/2146/review_report

by Dingguo Jiang [1], Yun Xu [2,3,*], Yang Lu [4,*], Jingyi Gao [5] and Kang Wang [1]

Reviewer 2 Report

Comment 1: The subject addressed is within the scope of the journal.

Comment 2: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 3: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 4: I would like to request the author to emphasis on the contributions on practically and academically in implication session.

Comment 5: Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.

a. How the study was designed?

b. How the study was carried out?

c. How the data were analyzed?

Comment 6: Please explain your results into steps and links to your proposed method.

Comment 7: It is suggested to add articles entitled "Ekwueme & Agunwamba. Trend Analysis and Variability of Air Temperature and Rainfall in Regional River Basins", "Kumar & Singh. A Comparison between MLR, MARS, SVR and RF Techniques: Hydrological Time-series Modeling" and "S. S. Ojha et al. Comparison of Meteorological Drought using SPI and SPEI" to the literature review.

Comment 8: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

Comment 9: The discussion section needs to be described scientifically. Kindly frame it along the following lines:

i. Main findings of the present study
ii. Comparison with other studies
iii. Implication and explanation of findings
iv. Strengths and limitations
v. Conclusion, recommendation, and future direction.

24. https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/1/11/review_report

Exploring Local Riverbank Sediment Controls on the Occurrence of Preferential Groundwater Discharge Points

by Martin A. Briggs [1,*] ✉ 🆔, Kevin E. Jackson [2] ✉ 🆔, Fiona Liu [2] ✉, Eric M. Moore [2] ✉, Alaina Bisson [2] ✉ and Ashley M. Helton [2] ✉

Reviewer 1: Anonymous

Reviewer 2: Anonymous

Reviewer 3: Anonymous

Reviewer 2 Report

Comment 1: Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.

- How the study was designed?

- How the study was carried out?

- How the data were analyzed?

Comment 2: The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

Comment 3: Please underscore the scientific value added of your paper in your abstract and introduction.

Comment 4: More suitable title should be presented for the figure 5 instead of "SSURGO soil parameters extracted at PDP locations and the average bank soil parameters from both …...".

Comment 5: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 6: It is suggested to add articles entitled "Hazir S. Çadraku. Groundwater Quality Assessment for Irrigation: Case Study in the Blinaja River Basin, Kosovo" and "Piotr Langer. Groundwater Mining in Contemporary Urban Development for European Spa Towns" to the literature review.

Comment 7: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 8: Please explain your results into steps and links to your proposed method.

Comment 9: I would like to request the author to emphasis on the contributions on practically and academically in implication session.

Comment 10: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations,

underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

25.

Investigating water movements around a shallow shipwreck in Big Tub Harbour of Lake Huron: Implications for managing and preserving underwater shipwrecks

Bryan Flood ✉ ✉, Lakshika Girihagama ✉, Mathew G. Wells, Reza Valipour, Patricia Semcesen, Scott Parker

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	July 26, 2021
Decision Letter - Haibin Lv, Editor	23 Oct 2021
Revision 1	
Author Response	11 Apr 2022
Decision Letter - Ram Kumar, Editor	18 Oct 2022
Revision 2	
Author Response	4 Dec 2022
Decision Letter - Ram Kumar, Editor	19 Dec 2022
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Ram Kumar, Editor	22 Dec 2022

Reviewer #1: - We prefer if you use the third person singular, instead of the first person singular or plural (e.g. "we").

- More suitable title should be selected for the article.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

- More suitable title should be selected for the table 1 instead of "Summery of instruments deployed in Big Tub Harbour in 2015.".

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

- It is suggested to add articles entitled "Nazarnia et al. A Systematic Review of Civil and Environmental Infrastructures for Coastal Adaptation to Sea Level Rise", "Gholami & Baharlouii. Monitoring Long-term Mangrove Shoreline Changes along the Northern Coasts of the Persian Gulf and the Oman Sea" and "Cham et al. An Analysis of Shoreline Changes Using Combined Multitemporal Remote Sensing and Digital Evaluation Model" to the literature review.

- Page 14: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that:

"We compare the temperature time series acquired in the direct vicinity of the Sweepstakes and at the mouth of the harbour to see if there are any intrusive cold gravity flows in Big Tub Harbour induced by the upwelling of cold waters in Lake Huron. The upwelling events are identified as a drop in water temperature by 5-8 ^0C in the space of few hours."

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

- Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use ""_ext-link-type="uri" xlink:type="simple">https://crossref.org/").

26. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/14/8357/review_report

Reviewer 5 Report

Dear authors, thanks for having adopted some of my comments. However, the paper still suffers of several issues.
The authors have responded to all editors' comments in a suitable manner. As a result, the manuscript has improved enormously. Nevertheless, some further work is needed in order to make the text easier to follow by the readers.
Please follow the journal author's instructions. It would be useful for the reader to follow it. In general, the paper needs better organization.

The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the Research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. Please underscore the scientific value added of your paper in your abstract and Introduction.

The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest that the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrive your debate or Argument.
I have serious concern on introduction section. Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest that the author enhance your literature discussion and arrive your debate or Argument.
Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.
a. How the study was designed?
b. How was the study carried out?c. How were the data analyzed?

Please explain your results into steps and links to your proposed method.
I would like to request the author to emphasize the contributions practically and academically in the implication session.
Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or

the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

27. https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/13/10/498/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

Interoperable test cases to mediate between supply chain's test processes

The article presents the approach in detail. For this purpose, an interoperability model for test cases is presented. Based on the interoperability model, a cross-translation for test cases between test case languages is shown. The developed translation approach is capable of handling test case languages, which are different with respect to type safety and applied programming paradigms. Moreover, the readability of generated test cases is given to a test engineer. It means that the structure of the test case is readable, as well as the labelling of signals to generate helpful test reports for the test process.

l   This is an interesting piece of "Interoperable test cases to mediate between supply chain's test processes" work. Please underscore the scientific value added/contributions of your paper in your abstract and introduction and address your debate shortly in the abstract.

l   Introduction needs to include: What has been studied Introduction should be clearly stated research questions and targets first. Then answer several questions: Why is the topic important (or why do you study on it)? What are research questions or objectives? What are your contributions? Why is to propose this particular method (This must come from Literature discussion)?

l   The references need to update to 2022. For instance, Chunyan Zhu, Xu Guo & Shaohui Zou (2022) Impact of information and communications technology alignment on supply chain performance in the Industry 4.0 era: mediation effect of supply chain integration, Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering, 39:7, 505-520, DOI: 10.1080/21681015.2022.2099472; and Yudi Fernando, Ming-Lang Tseng, Ika Sari Wahyuni-Td, Ana Beatriz Lopes de Sousa Jabbour, Charbel Jose Chiappetta Jabbour & Cyril Foropon (2022) Cyber supply chain risk management and performance in industry 4.0 era: information system security practices in Malaysia, Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering, DOI: 10.1080/21681015.2022.2116495

l   The major defect of this **study is the debate or Argument is not clear** stated in the introduction session.

l   I would like to request the author to emphasis on the contributions on practically, methodology or academically in your discussion session.

l   Basically, you should enhance your findings, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your contributions/shortages and future study in this session.

28. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/24/10547/review_report

Reviewer 1 Report

1. Please provide more evidences of the literature review argument. The literature review is necessary for you to clarify the "contribution" of your study
2. Coworking spaces is sustainability. I think the author has to provide evidences "Another sustainability aspect that has been discussed in the context of coworking spaces is sustainable mobility. Whilst, Lejoux et al. identify sustainable mobility as a promising topic in this context, they unravel a great need to further frame the definitions of coworking spaces, sustainability, as well as mobility. Thus, while there is a suggested link, there are no clear findings". Perhaps, this is related to sharing ?
3. Table 4 should only show those validate result
4. What are the contribution ? The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript.
5. Sample size 27 can work on EFA and Q ?
6. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously

29. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/17/10727/review_report

Reviewer 1 Report

RELATIONAL APPROACHES RELATED TO DIGITAL SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT CONSOLIDATION

The links between causes and effects, however, are unclear. In order to reveal a true efficient and consolidated functional synergy within an advanced digital supply chain, the purpose of this study is to concentrate on the critical elements of digital supply chain management (SCM) consolidation. In this sense, this paper develops a theoretical framework to define relational considerations regarding the consolidation of digital SCM, pointing out the determinants of digital SCM resilience and the intelligent

digital tools for optimal SCM; proposes mathematical relationships to strengthen digital SCM; presents a case study on the selection and implementation of the optimal and timely solution. This research can help managers identify the critical technologies used in the transition of traditional supply chains to digital supply chains, as well as investigating the process by which their organization, which is a link in a supply chain, becomes aware of environmental disturbances, understands their significance and potential effects, determines the available planned or unplanned options, and assists them in the decision process.

l   This is an interesting paper that takes a compelling methodological approach to examine an important and timely set of issues on "DIGITAL SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT CONSOLIDATION". Please underscore the scientific value added/contributions of your paper in your abstract and introduction and address your debate shortly in the abstract.

l   The major defect of this **study is the debate or Argument is not clear** stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution needs to be proper addressing in this manuscript. What has been studied Introduction should be clearly stated research questions and targets first. Then answer several questions: Why is the topic important (or why do you study on it)? What are research questions or objectives? What are your contributions? Why is to propose this particular method (This must come from Literature discussion)? However, there are too many drawing figures in the context. I would suggest you to explain those figures in context properly or remove some of them. Usually, the figures are explaining the results.

l   *To be legible, the whole text must be completely edited with the help of a native English editor to polish your writing*

l   The literature review is necessary for you to clarify the "contribution" of your study. Each reference mentioned should be discussed; otherwise, it is not helpful just to list them or in tables. I would suggest you to include these new references in your context and references section. Chunyan Zhu, Xu Guo & Shaohui Zou (2022) Impact of information and communications technology alignment on supply chain performance in the Industry 4.0 era: mediation effect of supply chain integration, Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering, DOI: 10.1080/21681015.2022.2099472; and Ming-Lang Tseng, Thi Phuong Thuy Tran, Hien Minh Ha, Tat-Dat Bui & Ming K. Lim (2021) Sustainable industrial and operation engineering trends and challenges Toward Industry 4.0: a data driven analysis, Journal of Industrial and Production Engineering, 38:8, 581-59

l   Basically, you should enhance your findings, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your contributions/shortages and future study in this session.

30. https://www.qeios.com/read/M7CY7Q.2

[Commentary] Young Builders vs. University of Delhi: A case study of the priority to environment protection in New Delhi by the National Green Tribunal. v1

Laxmi Bohora[1], Raja Singh[1]

Author(s) details ∧   Declarations

1. School of Planning and Architecture, India

1. More suitable title should be selected for the article. A more concise and clear one is expected.

2. The abstract should highlight the contribution and innovation of the research.

3. The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. The current version is more like a project report rather than a scientific study.

31. https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7099/11/3/85/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

The authors proposed an interesting study "Agricultural economic growth, renewable energy supply and Co2 emissions nexus: Using ARDL approach". If authors are willing to incorporate following suggestions, then I would be willing to reconsider my decision.

1. Please spell out acronyms on the first mention. Even if you have defined an acronym in the abstract, it has to be defined again in the paper when first mentioned. Moreover, no synonym should be used in abstract.
2. The authors should revise the keywords. Your research theme is agricultural economic growth yet it unfit to be mentioned as keyword? Why is that?
3. The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your theoretical argument.
4. Only investigating the relationship of different variables is not a significant contribution to the existing literature. A volume of research is available on this issue and in my opening, this study adds very little to the available literature.
5. The authors should create different sub-sections under the "Literature review" heading to methodologically explain the findings from recent literature.
6. Introduction, literature review, empirical results, and discussion section should be critically evaluated by the authors. I recommend improving this section by critically analyzing the previous studies and arrive at their own argument. Following papers are recommended to use while expanding and improving this section of your paper.

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-022-23656-8
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148122012186

https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-022-20782-1

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148122002075

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2772427122000304

7. The captions of many figures are sufficient. It must be further outlined as Figure 2A, 2B etc.

8. For empirical analysis the authors haven't selected other empirical approaches i.e., AMG or CCEMG tests that have the better ability to tackle the cross-sectional issue.

9. Explanation of empirical findings can be better supplemented by the researchers by citing and explaining recent literature.

10. Also, I'm so disappointed regarding the policy formulation. It's very common and presented in many previous studies. I suggest to the authors that they should suggest some new practical and managerial implications for sustainable development.

11. What are the future research directions of this study?

32. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/5/4662/review_report

Reviewer 4 Report

I am writing about the manuscript (sustainability-2180312) entitled "Towards a multidimensional model for evaluating sustainable effect of FDI on development of host 2 developing countries, evidence from Africa".

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. It is interesting and provides some good insight into the existing literature. I recommend for the paper substantial modifications and refinements of the present version. My comments are as follows:

1. From the very beginning of the Abstract, authors failed to address the research gap, and novelty of the study which are very important for the general readers.

2. What was the justification to select the study area, it needs to be strengthened. This is the main limitation of this study that it only focused on only specific local region so it cannot be generalized. For this reason, strong motivation needs to be built.

3. The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. The authors have presented a lot of data and figures in the introduction section. I would suggest the authors enhance your theoretical discussion and arrive at your theoretical argument.

4. Prior to the objective, the contribution of the paper should be clearly mentioned that how this study is helpful for the stakeholders.

5. The authors should discuss more about the "FDI" and "economic growth" in the manuscript accordingly. The current explanation is not enough.

6. The authors should perform the VIF analysis for more brevity.

7. More explanations and interpretations must be added for the results. In this regard, it is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before and more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, and discussion, which are not enough.

8. The conclusion and policy recommendations are not well written. Authors should add more to this section, especially in the aspect of policy framing and implementation.

In summary, the work has the potential to be published but before it should be considered for publication, it has to pass through professional proofreading and all the highlighted points above need to be corrected and implemented.

33. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/13/10320/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

Dear researchers,

With a great pleasure I offer my review. Honestly, I appreciate the carried work and I must admit it is a very important research for the balneo and wellness area in Romania. Still, it needs more substance for being fit to MDPI. You will find my comments in the following paragraphs.

Overall

The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the main results, and major conclusions.

In the introduction, before starting the mentioned references, there is a need to add 7-8 lines related to the subject of the paper and write in general introduction. After that you should connect them with the references.

The irrelevant and unsuitable references must be removed.

The major downside of this study is the debate or Argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your debate or argument.

The literature review is necessary for you to clarify the "contribution" of your study. In the current form, there are no pieces of literature to support your study. The author failed to present the study debates and failed to discuss the debates. In general, the author should present the specific debate for your study.

moreover -the name of the special issues is related to the sustainability. I would like to add a more express link between your research and the idea of sustainability.

1. Objective of the paper

It is not very clear what is the main objective of the research.
a. "The objective of this study is to carry out a survey regarding" - this is not an objective - it is part of the methodological framework.

b. "to highlight the importance of the administrative factor in the development and diversification of" - this could be part of the main goal of the paper.

2. Literature review
The literature review is missing or is based only on few studies which are related to Romanian territory. I strongly suggest finding relevant studies for this paper.
Your paper is based should have wellness development as a keyword and I suggest at least one paper which was published in Sustainability -

Andreu, M. G. N. L., Font-Barnet, A., & Roca, M. E. (2021). Wellness tourism—new challenges and opportunities for tourism in Salou. *Sustainability*, *13*(15), 8246.
or
Global Wellness Institute. Understanding Wellness: Opportunities & Impacts of the Wellness Economy for Regional Development; Global Wellness Institute: Miami, FL, USA, 2019
or
Quintela, J., Costa, C., & Correia, A. (2017). The role of health and wellness tourism in sustainable territorial development.

3, Methodology - It is very unclear the design of the methodology, First, you use the term survey " to carry out a survey regarding.." but there is no description of the survey (how many administrative units, what where the questions etc.) Moreover - the design of the methodology is very poor - field work and bibliographic documentation is very confusing.

4. there is no presentation of the study area. as a geographical journal, I would expect to have at least some words for describing the area. Location, population, number of tourists, number of accommodations etc.

5. Results.

Most of the results are actually a description of some villages/towns from Romania. But the results are not based on your methodological framework.

6. I suggest taking into consideration also the level of development and size of the localitites as they seem to be more important factors than the political aspects.For example, I would use the Local human development index created by Dumitru Sandu to add more value to Moreover, some of the administrations had dedicated funds for developing the infrastructure (such as Rural development funds or Leader Funds). This should be a factor, too.

7. Conclusions and discussions should be more focused on the findings and also put together. Fo example - "Today, the use of IT technology and Web-GIS in particular is the most appropriate way to promote the balneological and tourist attractiveness at the scale of rural settlements." does nothing to do with the paper.
There are few paragraphs or expressions that should be double checked but overall the English level is very good.

4.3. Localities with antecedent valorised balneological factors
risks of unpopularity - lack of attractiveness

34. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/7/3891/review_report

Novel Fuzzy Composite Indicators for Locating a Logistics Platform under Sustainability Perspectives

by Hana Ayadi [1,2,3,*] ✉ ⓘ, Nadia Hamani [2] ✉ ⓘ, Lyes Kermad [1] ✉ ⓘ and Mounir Benaissa [3] ✉

Reviewer 4 Report

I would suggest the author apply these chapters to organize this paper. Chapter 1 Introduction; Chapter 2 Literature Review; Chapter 3 Method; Chapter 4 Results; Chapter 5 Implications; Chapter 6 Conclusions; and References. In the present version, I think this might confuse the readers.

The three main criteria for this manuscript are: (a) quality and content of the research/review; (b) Quality, brevity and clarity of presentation; (c) Significance, relevance and timeliness of the topic. In addition, this title is (i) coverage of the literature/significant developments in the field or clarity of discussion within an emerging topic; (ii) originality, new perspectives or insights; (iii) international interest; and (iv) relevance for governance, policy or practical perspectives relevant to the focus of this manuscript. However, this study is lacking the most essential criteria. Hence, I think the author needs to consider these criteria before your submission.

The manuscript is hard to follow, using too many abbreviations. Indeed, the full terms and the abbreviations are repeating during the context.

Please make sure that a competent editor checks the English. Use of the first person ("I," "we," etc.) and third-person ("he," "she" etc.) must be avoided.

You have to re-write your paper completely. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

Please underscore the scientific value-added of your paper in your abstract and introduction. The introduction should be clearly stated research questions and targets first. Then answer several questions: Why is the topic important (or why do you study on it)? What are research questions? What has been studied? What are your contributions? Why is to propose this particular method? An outline of the paper can also be included. Please build upon the great work we have published on these subjects.

Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your literature discussion and arrives at your debate or argument.

The mathematical formulation is logically and clearly presented. In addition, the case and associated data analysis are illustrative to demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed method. Table 4 needs to rearrange, it is not clear in the current version.

Please explain the tables in more detail and interpreted what those tables presented.

Please explain your results in steps and links to your proposed method.

I would like to request the author to emphasize the contributions practically and academically in the implications session.

Please put **particular emphasis on its novelty and expected significance** for the field of **environmental science and technology or MCDM field**.

Please make sure your **conclusions section underscore** the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the **applicability of your findings/results**, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions,

limitations, underscore the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

35. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/14/8357/review_report

Benefit–Risk Perceptions of FinTech Adoption for Sustainability from Bank Consumers' Perspective: The Moderating Role of Fear of COVID-19

by Ruzita Abdul-Rahim [1,*] ✉ �ID, Siti Aisah Bohari [1] ✉ �ID, Aini Aman [1] ✉ �ID and Zainudin Awang [2] ✉ �ID

Reviewer 1: Anonymous

Reviewer 2: Zoltán Zéman

Reviewer 3: Anonymous

Reviewer 4: Anonymous

Reviewer 5: Anonymous

Reviewer 5 Report

Dear authors, thanks for having adopted some of my comments. However, the paper still suffers of several issues.
The authors have responded to all editors' comments in a suitable manner. As a result, the manuscript has improved enormously. Nevertheless, some further work is needed in order to make the text easier to follow by the readers.
Please follow the journal author's instructions. It would be useful for the reader to follow it. In general, the paper needs better organization.

The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the Research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. Please underscore the scientific value added of your paper in your abstract and Introduction.

The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest that the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrive your debate or Argument.
I have serious concern on introduction section. Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest that the author enhance your literature discussion and arrive your debate or Argument.
Methods section determines the results. Kindly focus on three basic elements of the methods section.
a. How the study was designed?
b. How was the study carried out?
c. How were the data analyzed?

Please explain your results into steps and links to your proposed method. I would like to request the author to emphasize the contributions practically and academically in the implication session.
Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

36. https://www.mdpi.com/2079-4991/12/23/4117/review_report

Reviewer 2 Report

The authors have reported that the nonvolatile ternary memristor is based on fluorine-benzimidazole copolymer: Au NPs composites. This manuscript is not clear and needs improvement in presentation. To publish the journal, the manuscript can be accepted after revising the following errors.

1. The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrive at your debate or argument.

2. In Section result and discussion, authors should improve the result interpretation. All graphs are not systematic. Please pay more attention to the section result and discussion. This section should be systematized.

3. The author should replace the electrical storage word with data storage.

4. The author has mentioned that Au NPs can improve the photoelectric properties but there are no results related to this statement. The author should perform related experiments or remove the relevant sentences.

5. There are several typographical issues. An author should carefully revise it for such errors.

37. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0275200

Relationship between anxiety and internet searches before percutaneous ultrasound-guided diagnostic procedures: A prospective cohort study

Marcio Meira ✉, Almir Galvão Vieira Bitencourt co, Demian Jungklaus Travesso co, Rubens Chojniak co,
Paula Nicole Vieira Pinto Barbosa

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review
					�

Peer Review History

Original Submission	August 25, 2021
Decision Letter - Marco Cascella, Editor	20 Oct 2021
Revision 1	
Author Response	4 Dec 2021
Decision Letter - Marco Cascella, Editor	7 Jan 2022
Revision 2	
Author Response	12 Feb 2022
Decision Letter - Francisco Sampaio, Editor	7 Jun 2022
Revision 3	
Author Response	22 Jul 2022
Decision Letter - Francisco Sampaio, Editor	9 Aug 2022
Revision 4	
Author Response	29 Aug 2022
Decision Letter - Francisco Sampaio, Editor	12 Sep 2022
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Francisco Sampaio, Editor	26 Sep 2022

Reviewer #1: I am glad to review and assess this exciting article, entitled, "Anxiety and internet research before percutaneous ultrasound-guided diagnostic procedures". Invasive procedures guided by ultrasound (US) are part of the routine medical diagnostic investigation. The lack of knowledge related to technical aspects about them can lead the patient to seek complementary information on the internet, which can trigger anxiety. However, the intersection between the areas of Radiology and Psychology is poorly studied. Here we show the profile of an anxious patient before an US-guided intervention.

The organization of this article is good and partly satisfactory. The Introduction section, methodology portions are adequate. I suggest the authors improve these parts overall to enhance the work quality. As suggested, I recommend that authors do a little more work and add the latest literature to support the study. I accept this manuscript after minor revision, as I have recommended.

Some valuable comments are given below;

• The manuscript needs language, grammar, and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker (Writing quality is inferior. Numerous grammatical mistakes and meaningless sentences)

• The primary defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and your debate or argument.

• The research gap is not evident and appropriate.

• Must add much more explanations and interpretations for the results, which are not enough

• It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before (more justification is needed)

• Should add a flowchart to the article to show the research methodology

38. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/20/13275/review_report

Peer-Review Record

Effect of Climate Change on the Quality of Soil, Groundwater, and Pomegranate Fruit Production in Al-Baha Region, Saudi Arabia: A Modeling Study Using SALTMED

by Abdulaziz G. Alghamdi [1,*] ✉ ⬤, Anwar A. Aly [2] ⬤ and Hesham M. Ibrahim [1,3] ⬤

Reviewer 1: Anonymous

Reviewer 2: Anonymous

Reviewer 3: Anonymous

Reviewer 4: Anonymous

Dear authors, I have reviewed your article entitled "Impact of climate change on soil and groundwater quality and 2 pomegranate fruit production in an arid environment: SALT-3 MED model application in the Al-Baha region, Saudi Arabia". The manuscript does meet the required quality standards to be considered for publication. But it still needs some revisions. There are many grammar mistakes as well as unclear expressions under the in the writing in conclusion part that I cannot point out fully since they are a lot. Hence, the manuscript cannot be accepted in its present form. There are some comments, which are to be incorporated in order to improve the manuscript, as given below: I think this paper has author did a good job discussing, My concern is that literature is not well cited, in the introduction the author writes almost an entire paragraph before citing one or two articles at the end. Major revision is required in that section, and major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your debate or argument. A more suitable title should be selected for the article. The article should be carefully checked for: typos, space, punctuation marks and uppercase issues. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the need for the research, and the major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone Please double-check the manuscript for abbreviations. Abbreviations must be spelled out the first time they are mentioned in the abstract and starting again with the introduction section The list of keywords should be selected carefully. Please be consistent in using the terms like that dS m-1 and (dS/m) whole manuscript Line 173. please seen the carefully subscript and superscript thoroughly whole manuscript Line; 356-383 the conclusion part is too much longer it should be concise and informative. So this part to be recasted as it needs proper knitting to make it more appealing. (Take the help of linguistically competent person). Kindly concise the concluding remarks for a gist and clearly mention the how this paper could play role for scientific community. Add some limitations, and underscore the scientific value added to your paper in the conclusion section. The novelty of the work must be identified and stated. The authors should try to explain why this paper is relevant to the wider readership. Please highlight the novelty of work in the right manner. Clearly discuss outcomes and what research gaps it covers. Please show how this paper has a strong correlation with environmental/atmosphere cleaner production/sustainability concerns. Grammar and syntax must be improved. Revision with the help of a native English speaker is highly recommended.

39. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0277245

Digital economy, scientific and technological innovation, and high-quality economic development: A mediating effect model based on the spatial perspective

Yang Lu, Shuang Zhu

Published: November 7, 2022 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0277245

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	July 8, 2022
Decision Letter - Atif Jahanger, Editor	17 Aug 2022
Revision 1	
Author Response	28 Sep 2022
Decision Letter - Atif Jahanger, Editor	24 Oct 2022
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Atif Jahanger, Editor	28 Oct 2022

Reviewer #2: The authors proposed an interesting study "The impact of transport energy consumption and foreign direct investment on CO2 emissions in ASEAN countries". The paper is well-structured and conveys a deal of information. I want to suggest a few suggestions to improve the manuscript quality and better readability.

1. The English language needs more work. The paper needs to be edited by a native English speaker.

2. The introductory line of the Abstract is not convincing. The authors should start with the purpose of this study.

3. There are only two acronyms in the abstract. It is better to write full abbreviations in the Abstract section accordingly.

4. In the first paragraph of the introduction section, the authors report the 21st century. The term st should be in superscript.

5. The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your theoretical argument.

6. The introduction part of the study needs improvement and story flow and the authors need to give proper contributions to their study.

7. The indicators of influencing factors are not introduced specifically.

8. It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction section accordingly.

9. There is a need to do a more rigorous and systematic literature review. The authors should clearly mention the literature gap.

10. A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.

11. The authors should report the data sources in proper reference shape with website links.

12. All acronyms should be in capital letters.

13. Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.

14. Also, I'm so disappointed regarding the policy formulation. It's very common and presented in many previous studies. I suggest to the authors that they should suggest some new practical and managerial implications for a sustainable environment.

15. What are the future research directions of this study?

40. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/12/9161/review_report

by Pietro Rizzo [1,*], Antonio Bucci [2], Pamela Monaco [2], Anna Maria Sanangelantoni [1], Gino Naclerio [2], Mattia Rossi [1], Paola Iacumin [1], Federica Bianchi [1], Claudio Mucchino [1], Nicolò Riboni [1], Dario Avagliano [3], Francesco Coraggio [3], Antonella Caputi [4] and Fulvio Celico [1]

Reviewer 1: Chao Dong

Reviewer 2: Anonymous

Reviewer 3: Maurizio Barbieri

Dear Author,
The article's abstract is comprehensive and summarizes the work's general content well. Below you can find some minor suggestions.
1. Abstract section should refer to the study findings, methodologies, discussion, and conclusion. It is suggested to present the abstract in one 200-250 words paragraph.
2. The introduction section is detailed but needs significant reorganization. It could be strengthened by adding more references.
3. Please add a sentence or two to recap how your study differs from what has already been done in the literature to ascertain the contributions more strongly.
4. The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented in the introduction.
5. The principal defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. Therefore, I suggest the Author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrive at your debate or Argument.
6. It is suggested to present the article's structure at the end of the introduction.
7. Please ensure your conclusions section underscores the scientific value added to your paper and the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more detail. You should enhance your contributions and limitations, underscore the scientific value added to your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.
8. It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with similar studies done before.

41. https://zaguan.unizar.es/record/121834/files/texto_completo.pdf (link to manuscript submission posted by the author – not the open review file)
Link to the final published paper:
https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0021915020314933

Glycerol kinase deficiency in adults:
Description of 4 novel cases, systematic review and development of a clinical diagnostic score

Itziar Lamiquiz-Moneo [a], Rocio Mateo-Gallego [a, b], Jacinto Fernández-Pardo [c], Chuan López-Ariño [a], Victoria Marco-Benedí [a], Ana M. Bea [a], Lia Ferraro [c], Estibaliz Jarauta [a, d], Ana Cenarro [a, e], Fernando Civeira [a, d]

[a] Hospital Universitario Miguel Servet, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria Aragón (IIS Aragón), CIBERCV, Zaragoza, Spain
[b] Departamento de Fisiatría y Enfermería, Facultad de Ciencias de la Salud y del Deporte, Universidad de Zaragoza, Huesca, Spain
[c] Servicio de Medicina Interna (Unidad de Lípidos), Hospital General Universitario Reina Sofía, Murcia, Spain
[d] Departamento de Medicina, Psiquiatría y Dermatología, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Zaragoza, Zaragoza, Spain
[e] Instituto Aragonés de Ciencias de la Salud (IACS), Zaragoza, Spain

Reviewer 4: - More suitable Highlights should be presented.

- More suitable title should be selected for the article.

- The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

- It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

- The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

- The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Sections and sub-sections should be numbered in order.

- More suitable title should be selected for the figure 1 instead of "Flow-chart".

- Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review: Swierczynski, A. Pathogenicity of Endocrine Dysregulation in Autism: The Role of the Melanin-Concentrating Hormone System; An et al. GRIK3 rs490647 is a Common Genetic Variant between Personality and Subjective Well-being in Chinese Han Population; Ebrahimipour et al. Isolation and Characterization of Glutaminase-free L-asparaginase Produced by Staphylococcus sp. MGM1.

- Page 7: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that: "Briefly, particle concentration and diffusion coefficients were obtained from the measured amplitudes and attenuation of their spectroscopically distinct lipid methyl group NMR signals using the 2D diffusion-ordered 1H NMR spectrometry (DSTE) pulse. The methyl signal was surface fitted with 9 lorentzian functions associated with each lipoprotein subclasses: large, medium and small of the main lipoprotein classes.

The area of each lorentzian function was related to the lipid concentration of each lipoprotein subclass, and the size was calculated from their diffusion coefficient."

- Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the results, which are not enough.

- It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

- "Notation" should be added to the article.

- DOI of the references must be added (you can use "https://crossref.org/").

42. https://www.scribd.com/document/506984051/Chemical-and-physical-properties-of-poly-lactic-acid-modified-bitumen# (submission file posted by authors, not an open review)

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2090447921001490 (final published paper)

Civil Engineering

Chemical and physical properties of poly (lactic) acid modified bitumen

Nashriq Jailani [a], Ahmad Nazrul Hakimi Ibrahim [a], Abdur Rahim [b] ✉,
Norhidayah Abdul Hassan [c] ✉ , Nur Izzi Md. Yusoff [a] ⚇ ✉

a Dept. of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Built Environment, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Selangor, Malaysia
b Dept. of Transportation Engineering and Management, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan
c School of Civil Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Johor, Malaysia

List of comments and response

Point 1: More suitable title should be selected for the article.

Point 2: The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

Point 3: It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

Point 4: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Point 5: The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

Point 6: More suitable title should be presented for the figure 11 instead of "Softening point value of PLA-modified bitumen".

Point 7: It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before.

Point 8: A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.

Point 9: Following, you will find some new related references which should be added to literature review: Saedi & Oruc. The Effects of Nano Bentonite and Fatty Arbocel on Improving the Behavior of Warm Mixture Asphalt against Moisture Damage and Rutting; Shihab et al. Effects of Temperature in Different Initial Duration Time for Soft Clay Stabilized by Fly Ash Based Geopolymer; Nhabih et al. Study a Structural Behavior of Eccentrically Loaded GFRP Reinforced Columns Made of Geopolymer Concrete.

Point 10: Page 11: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that: "Lower indexes were observed for the area under the band of C-O with C-C for the unwashed (11.0 to 7.0%) and washed (10.6 to 5.1%) samples. On the other hand, an increasing index pattern was observed for both the C=O bond with C-C (unwashed= 4.7 to 17.9%; washed=12.1 to 16.9%) and the C=O with C=C (unwashed=1.0 to 7.3%; washed=9.0 to 18.9%).".

Point 11: Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

Point 12: It is suggested to add articles entitled "Iqbal et al. Improving the Aging Resistance of Asphalt by Addition of Polyethylene and Sulphur", "Kadhim & AlMutairee. An Experimental Study on Behavior of Sustainable Rubberized Concrete Mixes" and "Trang et al. The Study of Dynamics Heterogeneity in SiO2 Liquid" to the literature review.

Point 13: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

43. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0283731

Structural transformation and political economy: A new approach to inclusive growth

Madiha Kamal, Ambreen Fatima

Published: August 2, 2023 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0283731

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	July 18, 2022
Decision Letter - Atif Jahanger, Editor	26 Sep 2022
Revision 1	
Author Response	11 Feb 2023
Decision Letter - Atif Jahanger, Editor	15 Mar 2023
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Atif Jahanger, Editor	3 Apr 2023

Reviewer #1: 1. Please rewrite abstract and elaborate more on the main findings of your analyses.

2. Describe your data and justify the time line of data selection in your write up.

3. Policy and recommendation section must include the main findings and their implication.

Reviewer #2: I read the paper very carefully and topic is very interesting. The paper have many issues for example methodology is very poor and not written properly. It is very hard to extract information

from the graphs given in the text. The paper is very much lengthy and its length can be reduced by merging the graph. I think authors need to employ latest econometric techniques.

Reviewer #3: This manuscript reports on "Structural Transformation and Political Economy: A New Approach to Inclusive Growth". I want to suggest a few suggestions to improve the manuscript's quality and better readability.

1. The English language needs more work. There are many grammatical and typo mistakes in this manuscript. The paper needs to be edited by a native English speaker.

2. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results, and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

3. We prefer if you use the third person singular, instead of the first person singular or plural (e.g. "you, we, our").

4. The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your theoretical argument.

5. The authors made this study unnecessary long and vague. Just presenting some facts and figures are not enough.

6. The copy paste diagrams are not allowed and suitable references should be provided.

7. Theoretical framework section is missing.

8. Elasticity method should be referenced.

9. See lines 687-688: the authors mentioned "(the citation must be included here)". Please be consistent.

10. Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

11. Notation" should be added to the article.

12. What are the next policy implications?

13. What are the limitations and future research agenda?

44. https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/articles/2-140

Home › Articles › Realizing a human-centered digitalization of the energy sector

OPEN LETTER

Realizing a human-centered digitalization of the energy sector [version 1; peer review: 1 approved, 2 approved with reservations]

Heather Jean Arghandeh Paudler ✉ ⓘ, Valeria Jana Schwanitz, August Wierling

This article is included in Horizon 2020 gateway   H2020

Open Peer Review

Approval Status ✓ ? ?

	1	2	3
Version 1 15 Dec 22	✓ view	? view	? view

1. **Rafael Mayo-Garcia**, CIEMAT, Madrid, Spain
2. **Nicolò Rossetto**, European University Institute, Fiesole, Toscana, Italy
3. **Siyu Ren**, Nankai University, Tianjin, Tianjin, China

The manuscript needs improve the quality of the introduction section, because the author should tell us why you need to analyze the problem and what is the relationship of the factors

you mentioned, and which is very important to us.

The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clear stated. Hence, I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

I noticed that the novelty of this paper is not described in detail. The author needs to elaborate on the importance of this research topic.

A summary of the research gaps in the existing literature allows the reader to understand the differences in the Review.

45. https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/19/10542/review_report

Reviewer 1 Report

I would suggest the author apply these chapters to organize this paper. Chapter 1 Introduction; Chapter 2 Literature Review; Chapter 3 Method; Chapter 4 Results; Chapter 5 Implications; Chapter 6 Conclusions; and References. In the present version, I think this might confuse the readers.

The three main criteria for this manuscript are (a) quality and content of the research/review; (b) Quality, brevity, and clarity of presentation; (c) Significance, relevance, and timeliness of the topic. In addition, this title is (i) coverage of the literature/significant developments in the field or clarity of discussion within an emerging topic; (ii) originality, new perspectives or insights; (iii) international interest; and (iv) relevance for governance, policy or practical perspectives relevant to the focus of this manuscript. However, this study is lacking most of the important criteria. Hence, I think the author needs to consider these criteria before your submission.

Please make sure that a competent editor checks the English. Use of the first person ("I", "we", etc.) and third-person ("he", "she" etc) must be avoided.

The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions.

Please underscore the scientific value-added of your paper in your abstract and introduction.

The introduction should be clearly stated research questions and targets first. Then answer several questions: Why is the topic important (or why do you study on it)? What are research questions? What has been studied? What are your contributions? Why is it to propose this particular method? An

outline of the paper can also be included. Please build upon the great work we have published on these subjects.

The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clearly stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives at your debate or argument.

The literature review is necessary for you to clarify the "contribution" of your study. In the current form, there are no pieces of literature to support your study. The author failed to present the study debates and failed to discuss the debates. In general, the author should present the specific debate for your study.

I would request the author to cite more solid evidences for this study. In addition, the Literature review is comprehensive to demonstrate the understanding of the background studies. For instance, "Bai et al.(2011) presented ………..". "Chen et al. (2005) also showed ………" The controversy is ………

Please explain the tables in more detail and interpreted what those tables presented.

Please explain your results into steps and links to your proposed method.

I would like to request the author to emphasize the contributions practically and academically in the implications section.

Please make sure your conclusions section underscores the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more detail. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value-added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

46. https://eprints.uad.ac.id/36418/1/Korespondensi-AF-Comparison%20of%20Machine%20Learning%20Approach%20for%20Waste%20Bottle%20Classification-ESJ.pdf (resubmission file posted by authors, not an open review)

https://www.ijournalse.org/index.php/ESJ/article/view/1106 (final accepted paper)

Comparison of Machine Learning Approach for Waste Bottle Classification

Abdul Fadlil [1*], Rusydi Umar [2], Sunardi [1], Arief Setyo Nugroho [2]

[1] Department of Electrical Engineering, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, 55166 Indonesia.

[2] Master Program of Informatics, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, 55166 Indonesia.

Abstract

The use of machine learning for the image classification process is growing all the time. Many methods can be used to classify an image with good accuracy. Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and Support Vector Machine (SVM) are popular methods for this case. The two approaches have differences in the data training process to achieve classification objectives. Although there are some differences between these approaches, there are some advantages to both of them. This research explores the comparison of the two CNN and SVM methods by comparing the training process carried out and the accuracy results of the classification. The process stages are divided into pre-processing, training, and testing. The objects used are ten waste plastic bottles with different brands of medium size with a total data of 1100 images. Based on the observations, both methods have advantages and disadvantages in the data training and classification process. However, from the results, CNN's accuracy is better than SVM. The accuracy of both networks is 99% for CNN and 74% for SVM, respectively. So, from the results of experiments that have been carried out in the study, it was found that CNN was still better than SVM.

The article is well established and also authors present valuable results. In my idea it could be published with major revision. Authors should add more interpretations for the results. Some comments which could be help to improve the article are presented.

Comment 1: The manuscript needs language, grammar and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker.

Comment 2: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 3: Page 5: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that: "The pre-processing method used in SVM is the same as the previous method. The data will be divided into ten folders based on the name of the plastic bottle. Next is the process of converting the image from RGB to BGR and changing the image size to 227x227 pixels. Before the training process, the image data was given a GrabCut segmentation process to remove the background and only left objects are displayed, as shown in Figure 6.".

Comment 4: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 5: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

47. https://lpa.ubt.ac.id/repository/peer_review/FILE_Corres_24776e370c00aa7eeeecb8dd63646f98.pdf (resubmission file posted by the authors, not an open review)

https://www.civilejournal.org/index.php/cej/article/view/3619/0

Effects of HDPE Utilization and Addition of Wetfix-Be to Asphalt Pavement in Tropical Climates

Daud Nawir [1]*, Achmad Zultan Mansur [1]

[1] Civil Engineering Department, University Borneo Tarakan, Amal lama, Tarakan 77123, Indonesia.

Reviewer #3: The article is well established and also authors present valuable results. In my idea it could be published with major revision. Authors should add more interpretations for the results. Some comments which could be help to improve the article are presented.

Comment 1: The article needs language, grammar and syntactic editing. The English language usage should be checked by a fluent English speaker.

Comment 2: The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this article. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 3: Page 9: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that: "Table 8 shows that determining The Optimum Asphalt Level (OAC) of the concrete asphalt coating mixture (AC-WC) in this study used asphalt levels ranging from 4% to 7%, with an increase in asphalt levels of 0.5%. Based on the previous results that analyzed the optimum asphalt content was 5.10%, a mix

design was designed to make the test object with various levels of oil asphalt content, namely 4.5%, 5.0%, 5.5%, 6.0%, 6.5%, and 7% by weight of the mixture.".

Comment 4: Especially, the introduction section needs to re-organize. The major debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution debates are weak in this article. I would suggest the author to enhance your literature discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

Comment 5: Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

48. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Pai-Zheng-5/publication/343674130_A_Data-driven_Reversible_Framework_for_Achieving_Sustainable_Smart_Product-Service_Systems/links/61d06a7de669ee0f5c7c52fa/A-Data-driven-Reversible-Framework-for-Achieving-Sustainable-Smart-Product-Service-Systems.pdf (resubmission file posted by the authors, not open review)

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0959652620336635 (final published paper)

A data-driven reversible framework for achieving Sustainable Smart product-service systems

Xinyu Li [a] [b], Zuoxu Wang [b], Chun-Hsien Chen [b], Pai Zheng [c]

a Delta-NTU Corporate Laboratory for Cyber-Physical Systems, School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 639798 Singapore

b School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, 639798

c Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, 999077, Hong Kong, China

More suitable title should be selected for the article.

The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from the article, so it must be able to stand alone.

The necessity and innovation of the article should be presented to the introduction.

It is suggested to present the structure of the article at the end of the introduction.

A flowchart should be added to the article to show the research methodology.

The major defect of this study is the debate or Argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, the contribution is weak in this manuscript. I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument

More suitable title should be presented for tht table 1 instead of "Summary of smart sustainable/circularity strategies".

Literature review is not enough. There some articles, which must be added to literature review: • T. Floričić. Sustainable Solutions in the Hospitality Industry and Competitiveness Context of "Green Hotels"; • Jensen et al. Piloting a Methodology for Sustainability Education: Project Examples and Exploratory Action Research Highlights; • Loo & Mahdavinejad. Analysis of Design Indicators of Sustainable Buildings with an Emphasis on Efficiency of Energy Consumption (Energy Efficiency)

Page 16: the following paragraph is unclear, so please reorganize that: • "The smartness of Sustainable Smart PSS cannot be separated from the support of reliable domainspecific knowledge and common knowledge, and the data-driven development process also requires a continuous evolvement of the knowledge base in the long run. Especially, when a novel product-service solution is implemented, essential modifications are correspondingly made in the concepts and propositions of design principles, manufacturing methodology, logistic constraints, usage manners, and dismantling information. Hence, as the adjust step in the loop, knowledge evolvement aims to manage these logical modifications and close the loop in the cyber space."

It is suggested to compare the results of the present research with some similar studies which is done before

Much more explanations and interpretations must be added for the Results, which are not enough.

It is important to cite all equations into the main text

Please make sure your conclusions' section underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results, as indicated previously. Please revise your conclusion part into more details. Basically, you should enhance your contributions, limitations, underscore the scientific value added of your paper, and/or the applicability of your findings/results and future study in this session.

DOI of the references must be added (you can use "https://crossref.org/")

49. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0287849

Can digital economy improve employment structure?— Mediating effect based on a spatial Durbin model

Yang Lu, Lu Lu Zhou

Published: November 2, 2023 • https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0287849

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review

Peer Review History

Original Submission	March 19, 2023
Decision Letter - C. A. Zúniga-González, Editor	17 Apr 2023
Revision 1	
Author Response	31 May 2023
Decision Letter - C. A. Zúniga-González, Editor	13 Jun 2023
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - C. A. Zúniga-González, Editor	22 Jun 2023

Reviewer #3: Based on the panel data of 283 prefecture-level cities in China from 2011-2019, this paper constructs an indicator measurement system for the digital economy, economic agglomeration, innovation and entrepreneurship, and employment structure. But this issue has been extensively studied. Overall, the innovation and research value of this research is insufficient. Language style is colloquial. Moreover, there are many irregular errors in this work. Some comments are listing below:

1. The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument. I suggest the author rewrite the introduction section.

2. Introduction. The logic of the introduction writing still needs to be strengthened, how to introduce from digital economy to employment structure. The authors need to elaborate on the core concepts of the article, explain the definition of the core concepts, and explain the practical necessity of studying employment structure.

3. A summary of the research gaps in the existing literature allows the reader to understand the differences in the manuscripts.

4. A stronger motivation should be given or the contribution of this work should be clearly stated.

5. There is a need to do a more rigorous and systematic literature review. The authors should clearly mention the literature gap. The literature review does not cover some recent studies. Recently, some scholars have published quality papers on similar topic. Please see the following studies in this regard to strengthen your introduction and literature review. How does digital finance affect industrial transformation? How does financial development environment affect regional innovation capabilities? New perspectives from digital finance and institutional quality. Tax effect of digital economy development in China: The policy effect and transmission mechanism. Digital economy, entrepreneurial activity, and common prosperity: Evidence from China. Going green in China: How does digital finance affect environmental pollution? Mechanism discussion and empirical test; Energy internet, digital economy, and green economic growth: Evidence from China.

6. The mechanism analysis section seems so brief that the logical relationships of some variables are not accurately expressed. Addition, I suggest the author provide a mechanism analysis figure.

7. When explaining the reasons for choosing control variables, the authors need to explain why these variables were increased.

8. The author should provide more discussion of economic reasons for each regression result, not just describe the result. Moreover, there is not much discussion of the findings and how they link to the rest of the paper.

9. The study policy implication seems rather scanty. I think the authors must provide more specific policy recommendations for different results.

10. The language style is so colloquial. Please improve the use of English as well as the writing style throughout the paper, including the abstract and the main text. Please seek help of a professional editorial services. Once the language style fails to meet normal academic standards, I will choose to reject it.

"Based on the panel data of 283 prefecture-level cities in China from 2011-2019, this paper constructs an indicator measurement system for the digital economy, economic agglomeration, innovation and entrepreneurship, and employment structure, uses the entropy weight method to construct digital economy indicators and constructs a double fixed spatial Durbin model with mediating effects from a spatial perspective to measure the direct, indirect and total effects of digital economy, degree of economic agglomeration and innovation and entrepreneurship on employment structure." Similar long sentences should not appear in the manuscript again.

11. The author needs to replace all references in Chinese literature with English literature.

    50. https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0285695

Article	Authors	Metrics	Comments	Media Coverage	Peer Review ⌄

Peer Review History

Original Submission	March 11, 2023
Decision Letter - Umer Shahzad, Editor	3 Apr 2023
Revision 1	
Author Response	20 Apr 2023
Decision Letter - Umer Shahzad, Editor	28 Apr 2023
Formally Accepted	
Acceptance Letter - Umer Shahzad, Editor	10 May 2023

Reviewer #1: In this study, this study utilizes panel data from 30 Chinese provinces and cities spanning 2011 to 2020 to explore the impact of digitized inclusive finance on consumer consumption and high-quality economic development through a spatial econometric model. But this issue has been extensively studied. Overall, the innovation and research value of this research is insufficient. Language style is colloquial. Moreover, there are many irregular errors in this work. Some comments are listing below:

1. The major defect of this study is the debate or argument is not clear stated in the introduction session. Hence, I would suggest the author to enhance your theoretical discussion and arrives your debate or argument.

2. Introduction. The logic of the introduction writing still needs to be strengthened, how to introduce from Digital inclusive finance, Consumer consumption to high-quality economic development. The authors need to elaborate on the core concepts of the article, explain the definition of the core concepts, and explain the practical necessity of studying high-quality economic development.

3. The author needs to supplement the literature on the Digital inclusive finance, Consumer consumption and high-quality economic development. A summary of the research gaps in the existing literature allows the reader to understand the differences in the manuscripts.

4. The mechanism analysis section seems so brief that the logical relationships of some variables are not accurately expressed.

5. The author should provide more discussion of economic reasons for each regression result, not just describe the result. Moreover, there is not much discussion of the findings and how they link to the rest of the paper.

6. The literature review does not cover some recent studies. Recently, some scholars have published quality papers on similar topic. Please see the following studies in this regard to strengthen your introduction and literature review. Does the digital economy promote industrial green transformation? Evidence from spatial Durbin model. How does digital finance affect industrial transformation. Going green in China: How does digital finance affect environmental pollution? Mechanism discussion and empirical test. How does financial development environment affect regional innovation capabilities? New perspectives from digital finance and institutional quality. Does the internet development put pressure on energy-saving potential for environmental sustainability? Evidence from China

7. The summary section needs to reduce the description of the research background and add detailed research conclusions.

8. A stronger motivation should be given or the contribution of this work should be clearly stated.

9. The author needs to replace all Chinese references with English references.

10. It is necessary to provide a mechanism analysis figure in the manuscript.

11. In the manuscript, I did not see the reference section. I hope the author will supplement them in the revised version.

12. It would be appropriate to indicate future research directions and limitations of this at the end of the conclusion section just before references.

13. The language style is so colloquial. Please improve the use of English as well as the writing style throughout the paper, including the abstract and the main text. Please seek help of a native speaker or professional editorial services.

Electronic Supplementary Material 3

ID	Link	Anonymity	Journal	Publisher	Open review	Manuscript submission date
1	https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/15/12/2213/review_report	Eponymous	Water	MDPI	Yes	2022-12-30
2	https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/13/1/283/review_report	Anonymous	Applied Science	MDPI	Yes	2022-09-12
3	https://www.mdpi.com/2227-9067/10/1/23/review_report	Eponymous	Children	MDPI	Yes	2022-11-24
4	https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/8/1241/review_report	Anonymous	Water	MDPI	Yes	2022-02-24
5	https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/13/9/5288/review_report	Anonymous	Applied Science	MDPI	Yes	2023-03-13
6	https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1312/11/4/868/review_report	Anonymous	Journal of Marine Science and Engineer	MDPI	Yes	2023-02-23
7	https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/10/6/218/review_report	Anonymous	Information	MDPI	Yes	2019-05-15
8	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/10/5892/review_report	Eponymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2022-03-17
9	https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/14/18/4612/review_report	Anonymous	Remote Sensing	MDPI	Yes	2022-05-30
10	https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/19/21/14392/review_report	Anonymous	International Journal of Environmental I	MDPI	Yes	2022-09-26
11	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0235780	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2020-02-18
12	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0272950	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2021-08-23
13	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0247599	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2020-12-24
14	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0262610	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2021-05-27
15	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0249311	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2020-10-01
16	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0271026	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2021-09-07
17	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0254949	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2021-03-19
18	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0235780.r004	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2020-02-18
19	https://www.mdpi.com/2073-445X/12/7/1475/review_report	Anonymous	Land	MDPI	Yes	2023-06-19
20	https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/5/789/review_report	Anonymous	Water	MDPI	Yes	2021-12-19
21	https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/15/2/507/review_report	Anonymous	Remote Sensing	MDPI	Yes	2022-11-24
22	https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1312/11/8/1545/review_report	Anonymous	Journal of Marine Science and Engineer	MDPI	Yes	2023-07-06
23	https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/14/2146/review_report	Eponymous	Water	MDPI	Yes	2022-05-13
24	https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4441/14/1/11/review_report	Anonymous	Water	MDPI	Yes	2021-10-30
25	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0279862	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2021-07-26
26	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/14/8357/review_report	Anonymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2022-05-06
27	https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/13/10/498/review_report	Eponymous	Information	MDPI	Yes	2022-08-20
28	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/24/10547/review_report	Anonymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2020-11-23
29	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/17/10727/review_report	Eponymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2022-07-14
30	https://www.qeios.com/read/M7CY7Q.2	Eponymous	Qeios	Qeios	Yes	2023-04-16
31	https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7099/11/3/85/review_report	Eponymous	Economies	MDPI	Yes	2022-10-20
32	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/5/4662/review_report	Eponymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2023-01-08
33	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/13/10320/review_report	Anonymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2023-04-29
34	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/7/3891/review_report	Anonymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2021-01-11
35	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/14/8357/review_report	Anonymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2022-05-06
36	https://www.mdpi.com/2079-4991/12/23/4117/review_report	Eponymous	Nanomaterials	MDPI	Yes	2022-10-25
37	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0275200	Eponymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2022-04-10
38	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/14/20/13275/review_report	Anonymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2022-09-04
39	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0277245	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2022-07-08
40	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/15/12/9161/review_report	Eponymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2023-04-05
41	https://zaguan.unizar.es/record/121834/files/texto_completo.pdf	Anonymous	Atherosclerosis	Elsevier	No	2020-06-08
42	https://www.scribd.com/document/506984051/Chemical-and-physical-properties-of-poly-lactic-acid-modified-bitun	Anonymous	Ain Shams Engineering Journal	Elsevier	No	2019-11-19
43	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0283731	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2022-07-18
44	https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/articles/2-140	Eponymous	Open Research Europe	European Commision	Yes	2022-12-15
45	https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/13/19/10542/review_report	Anonymous	Sustainability	MDPI	Yes	2021-08-26
46	https://eprints.uad.ac.id/36418/1/Korespondensi-AF-Comparison%20of%20Machine%20Learning%20Approach%20f	Anonymous	Emerging Science Journal	Ital Publications	No	2022-03-30
47	https://lpa.ubt.ac.id/repository/peer_review/FILE_Corres_24776e370c00aa7eeeecb8dd63646f98.pdf	Anonymous	Civil Engineering Journal	Salehan Institute of Higher Education	No	2022-06-10
48	https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Pai-Zheng-5/publication/343674130_A_Data-driven_Reversible_Framework_f	Anonymous	Journal of Cleaner Production	Elsevier	No	2020-05-11
49	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0287849	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2023-03-19
50	https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/peerReview?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0285695	Anonymous	PLOS ONE	PLOS	Yes	2023-03-11

Electronic Supplementary Material 4. ChatGPT experiment #1

ChatGPT Hello! How can I assist you today?

User Can you help to change the wording of the following phrase without changing the meaning? Manual introduction of changes to the strings of characters, in order to reduce the similarity of the existing material to a source and making plagiarism more difficult to detect by the anti-plagiarism software, may have been a common practice.

ChatGPT Modifying the phrasing while preserving the meaning of the original sentence, we can say: "Engaging in the manual alteration of character sequences with the intention of diminishing the resemblance between the existing content and its source, thereby enhancing the challenge of detecting plagiarism using anti-plagiarism software, might have been a widespread convention." [Text similarity 4% according to https://www.prepostseo.com/plagiarism-comparison-search .]

User Can you give me another couple of examples of possible rephrasing?

ChatGPT Certainly! Here are a couple more examples of rephrasing the sentence while maintaining its meaning:

 1. "It was possibly commonplace to manually introduce changes to character strings, aiming to minimize the resemblance between the existing material and its source, thus rendering the detection of plagiarism more challenging for anti-plagiarism software." [Text similarity 0% according to https://www.prepostseo.com/plagiarism-comparison-search]

2. "The act of manually altering character sequences may have been widely practiced to reduce the similarity between the existing content and its source, thereby increasing the difficulty of detecting plagiarism using anti-plagiarism software." [Text similarity 16% according to https://www.prepostseo.com/plagiarism-comparison-search.]

Please note that these rephrased sentences retain the original meaning, but variations in wording can occur based on the desired emphasis or style of expression.

Electronic Supplementary Material 5. ChatGPT experiment #2

We have copied to ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com/) four paragraphs of an initial draft of the manuscript, namely from sections "Introduction" and "Detected cases of peer-review plagiarism", and asked the chatbot to generate an automatic review of them. Upon entering the paragraphs, our chat was as follows:

User Can you now synthesize an overview of the four paragraphs?

ChatGPT Certainly! Here's an overview that synthesizes the main points from the four paragraphs:

The overview focuses on a case of suspected plagiarism in peer-review reports for manuscripts submitted to a reputable journal. The lack of substance, vagueness, and odd jargon in these reports raised suspicions about their originality. To investigate further, the authors utilized an online plagiarism check tool, which revealed high similarity indices between the peer-review reports and other sources, indicating potential plagiarism.

An in-depth analysis of the peer-review reports uncovered exact quotes from the reports present in multiple sources, suggesting a new phenomenon. The length of the investigated quotes ranged from 21 to 44 words, surpassing the common rule of thumb that even five consecutive identical words indicate likely plagiarism. Moreover, it was observed that the same phrases were recycled across different manuscripts and disciplines, indicating a lack of discipline-specificity and an alarming level of vagueness in the plagiarized reviews.

The systemic problem underlying the case was addressed, highlighting the pressure placed on the scientific community due to the publish-or-perish system. Reviewing manuscripts is a time-consuming task, often seen as an unwelcome necessity. While there are potential benefits, such as early access to important work and skill development, many potential reviewers perceive the benefit-cost ratio as low. Some journals attempt to attract reviewers through incentives like article processing charge (APC) discount vouchers. However, unethical motivations for peer review, such as "engineering" rejections, stealing ideas, or boosting citations, also exist.

Finally, the registration of reviews through the Publons web platform was discussed as an additional incentive for reviewers. This practice raises logical and ethical concerns. On the logical side, the focus on quantity rather than quality becomes problematic, as the system does not provide an indication of review quality due to anonymity. Ethically, anonymous transactions cannot be considered purely altruistic, and the system may encourage a decrease in the quality of reviewing and promote an egocentric attitude, quantifying actions in arbitrary units.

In summary, the essay addresses the issue of suspected plagiarism in peer-review reports, explores the evidence of plagiarism, discusses the systemic problems in the scientific community, and raises concerns about incentives and ethical implications within the peer-review process.

I hope this overview captures the key points from your essay's paragraphs. If you have any further questions or need additional assistance, please let me know!

User Great! If my colleagues and I submitted the essay to a journal and if you were invited to review it, what would be your review?

ChatGPT If I were invited to review your essay, here's a sample review I would provide:

Title: Review of "Peer-review Plagiarism Case: Uncovering Systemic Issues"

Abstract:

The essay titled "Peer-review Plagiarism Case: Uncovering Systemic Issues" presents a detailed examination of a case involving suspected plagiarism in peer-review reports for manuscripts submitted to a reputable journal. The authors investigate the issue, analyze the evidence, discuss the systemic problems within the scientific community, and raise concerns about incentives and ethical implications within the peer-review process. Overall, the essay provides valuable insights into an important topic and contributes to the understanding of plagiarism in the peer-review system.

Strengths:

Thorough Analysis: The essay demonstrates a comprehensive analysis of the suspected plagiarism case, utilizing an online plagiarism check tool and conducting an in-depth examination of the peer-review reports. The authors effectively present evidence of high similarity indices and recycling of phrases across different sources, supporting their claims.

Clarity and Organization: The essay is well-structured, with each paragraph addressing a specific aspect of the topic. The writing is clear and concise, making it easy for readers to follow the arguments presented. Additionally, the transitions between paragraphs are smooth, ensuring logical flow throughout the essay.

Insightful Discussion: The essay delves into the systemic problems faced by the scientific community, emphasizing the pressure of the publish-or-perish system and the challenges associated with reviewing. The authors raise important ethical considerations, such as the potential motivations for plagiarism and the impact of anonymous transactions on the quality of reviews.

Suggestions for Improvement:

Further Contextualization: While the essay provides a thorough analysis of the specific case of plagiarism, it would benefit from additional contextualization. Providing a broader discussion on the prevalence of plagiarism in the peer-review process and the existing literature on this topic would strengthen the overall argument and enhance its relevance to the wider academic community.

Incorporation of Counterarguments: To present a more balanced perspective, it would be valuable to address potential counterarguments. For instance, exploring alternative explanations for the high similarity indices or discussing efforts and initiatives within the scientific community to mitigate plagiarism could add depth to the essay.

Strengthening the Conclusion: The essay could benefit from a stronger concluding section that effectively summarizes the key findings, highlights the implications of the case, and proposes potential solutions or recommendations for addressing plagiarism in peer reviews.

Overall, the essay provides a valuable contribution to the understanding of plagiarism in the peer-review system. With some minor revisions, such as further contextualization, incorporation of counterarguments, and a strengthened conclusion, the essay has the potential to make a significant impact within the academic community. I recommend accepting the essay for publication with the suggested improvements.

Please note that this is a fictional review based on the …

At this point the chatbot interrupted its reply. Upon requesting to regenerate its output, it changed it to the following:

ChatGPT As an AI language model, I don't have personal experiences or opinions, and I cannot be invited to review or provide feedback on specific articles or essays. I can assist you by providing general guidance or suggestions based on the content you've shared. If you have any specific questions or need assistance with any particular aspect of your essay, feel free to ask, and I'll do my best to help you.

User I found your earlier reply very useful, but it was interrupted by a network error. Could you repeat it?

ChatGPT I apologize for the inconvenience caused by the network error. Unfortunately, as an AI language model, I don't have the ability to recall or retrieve previous responses once they have been generated. Each response is generated based on the specific input provided in the current conversation. However, if you have any specific questions or need assistance with any particular aspect of your essay, please let me know, and I'll be happy to help you again.

User It started like "If I were invited to review your essay, here's a sample review I would provide: Title: Review of "Peer-review Plagiarism Case: Uncovering Systemic Issues" Abstract: The essay titled "Peer-review Plagiarism Case: Uncovering Systemic Issues" presents a detailed examination of a case involving suspected plagiarism in peer-review reports for manuscripts submitted to a reputable journal. The authors investigate the issue, analyze the evidence, discuss the systemic problems within the scientific community, and raise concerns about incentives and ethical implications within the peer-review process. Overall, the essay provides valuable insights into an important topic and contributes to the understanding of plagiarism in the peer-review system."

Could you continue it?

ChatGPT Certainly! Here's a continuation of the sample review:

Introduction: The introduction effectively sets the context by outlining the case of suspected plagiarism in peer-review reports. It highlights the significance of the issue and its implications for the integrity of the peer-review process. The introduction also provides a clear overview of the essay's structure, which aids in guiding the reader through the subsequent sections.

Strengths: One of the strengths of this essay is the thorough analysis of the peer-review reports and the evidence of plagiarism. The examination of exact quotes from multiple sources and the identification of recycled phrases across different disciplines provide compelling evidence of the systemic nature of the problem. This analysis effectively highlights the lack of discipline-specificity and vagueness in the plagiarized reviews.

Additionally, the discussion on the systemic problems within the scientific community, particularly the publish-or-perish system, is a valuable contribution. The essay sheds light on the pressure faced by reviewers and the challenges associated with voluntary reviewing. The incorporation of relevant references enhances the credibility of the argument and supports the claims made.

Furthermore, the exploration of the incentives and ethical concerns within the peer-review process, particularly the discussion on the Publons web platform, offers insightful perspectives. The logical and ethical issues surrounding the registration of reviews and its potential impact on review quality and reviewer motivations are thought-provoking.

Areas for Improvement: While the essay provides a comprehensive overview of the case and presents compelling evidence, it would benefit from a stronger connection between the motivations for plagiarism and the introduction of the Publons web platform. Strengthening this link would enhance the coherence and flow of the essay, ensuring a seamless transition between sections.

Additionally, further elaboration on potential solutions or recommendations to address the identified systemic problems could enhance the practical relevance of the essay. It would be beneficial to explore strategies to mitigate plagiarism in peer-review reports, promote ethical reviewing practices, and improve the overall quality of the peer-review process.

Conclusion: In conclusion, "Peer-review Plagiarism Case: Uncovering Systemic Issues" provides an insightful analysis of a concerning case and its implications for the peer-review system. The essay effectively explores the evidence of plagiarism, discusses systemic problems within the scientific community, and raises important ethical considerations. With some improvements in the logical progression between sections and the inclusion of potential solutions, this essay has the potential to make a valuable contribution to the ongoing discourse on plagiarism in peer-review. Overall, the essay presents a well-researched and thought-provoking examination of a critical issue.

Please note that this is a sample review and should not be considered as an actual review of your essay. It is provided for illustrative purposes only. If you have any specific questions or need further assistance, feel free to let me know.