

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_130701
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Distribution NO <sub>2</sub> In East Java From 2019-2021 And the Factors That Improve It
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The subject matter being discussed in this manuscript provides a significant contribution to environmental science by analysing the distribution of nitrogen dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> ) in East Java over three years. Also, this paper is important as it evaluates the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on air pollution levels, offering valuable insights into the role of human activities in NO <sub>2</sub> emissions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The present title is clear and also it accurately reflects the study's focus	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract covers all the key elements, but the wording can be refined for better clarity.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure are well organized; guides the readers smoothly through history, impacts, and solutions. The manuscript is well-structured with clear sections, including an introduction, methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The review paper is scientifically sound great, cited with recent and valid research possible.  Statistical Analysis: The paper presents NO <sub>2</sub> trends over time, but a deeper statistical evaluation (e.g., regression analysis, correlation with population density) would strengthen the conclusions.  Hoverer, A discussion on the accuracy of Sentinel-5P data and potential biases would enhance credibility.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The citation method is correct. The references are adequate and up to date, including the latest from 2020 -2023.  The authors could consider adding more on NO <sub>2</sub> distribution and satellite-based air quality monitoring would provide a broader context. You may refer to WHO reports in the subject matter.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Language is clear and scholarly, yet it needs thorough proofreading would improve readability. Also Some figures and charts could be better labeled to improve clarity.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript is scholarly written with a clear review paper format, addressing language clarity, statistical analysis, and structural improvements will significantly enhance the manuscript's quality	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Wali Mohammad Waseq</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Parwan university, Afghanistan</b>