



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_47301
Title of the Manuscript:	Shallow Water Empirical Remote Sensing Bathymetry using the blue/green and red spectrum regions
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:
(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title 'Shallow Water Empirical Remote Sensing Bathymetry using the blue/green and red spectrum regions', blue/green and red, or blue/green and blue /red? 2. Table 1 is actually a picture, please revised it. 3. What is the novelty for this paper? Please point it out in the paper directly. 4. The paper is lack of characteristic. What is the main motivation of the paper, to test the performance of an old method, or to test the performance of the Sentinel-2 images in bathymetry? If the motivation is to test a performance of an old method, I think it is not meaningful. If it is to test the performance of the Sentinel-2 images in bathymetry, I think that the experiments is not enough. In addition, the performance should be compared with other types of images such as Landsat TM, Landsat ETM, Landsat OLI, WorldView-2, WorldView-3, and SPOT-5, and so on. 5. The equation in line 69 is error. What is the meaning of the operation "in"? 6. The method is unclear. 7. The language and the format should be carefully re-edited. 8. What is the purpose to show the "Visible light water penetration"? Is "Visible light water penetration" one of the authors' results? 9. I really cannot get the purpose and the novelty of the paper from the discussion and the conclusions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Will revise table 1. 3. Will point out the paper novelty. 4. The purpose is to test the performance of the different portions of the electromagnetic spectrum in the blue/green and red regions of the spectrum and their combinations with reference to Stumpf (2003) reflectance bathymetry model, for specific depth ranges. 5. Will correct the equation in line 69. 6. Will make the method as clear as possible. 7. Language and format will be carefully edited. 8. The main purpose of showing the Visible light water penetration is to give an evidence of the actual penetration depths of the electromagnetic spectrum portions used in the investigation. 9. Will make them clear in both the discussion and conclusions.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	1. Table 3 is unnecessary.	I added this table to give the reader full information about my source data, but your opinion as specialized reader is acceptable and will take it off.

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	I agreed with the reviewer and have done all the required corrections and were highlighted in red.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>