에디티지 서비스를 이용해주셔서 감사합니다.

교정된 파일내용 및 에디터가 고객님을 위하여 남긴 코멘트, 그리고 아래의 메세지를 확인하여 주십시오.

만일 교정 작업과 관련하여 문의사항이 있으신 경우, 또는 수정하신 부분에 대해 에디터의 교정이 필요하신 경우EditageOnlineTM (http://app.editage.co.kr/)에서 아래와 같이 접수하실 수 있습니다.

또한, 해당 작업에 대한 피드백을 통하여 보다 개선된 서비스를 받아보실 수 있습니다. EditageOnlineTM에서 완료된 작업 다운로드 창 또는 이용후기를 통해 해당 작업에 대한 피드백을 남겨주시기 바랍니다.

\* 에디터가 남긴 코멘트에 대한 답신 및 교정내역에 대해 질문 사항이 있으신 경우, 무료 ‘질문사항 제출하기’를 통하여 에디터와 교신이 가능합니다. 다만 이 경우, 질문 내용은 에디터에게 직접 전달되므로 영문으로 작성하여 주시기를 부탁드립니다.

\*\* 사소한 수정에서도 언어 오류가 발생할 수 있기 때문에, 저널 투고 바로 직전에는 항상 최종적으로 원어민에게 교정을 받으신 이후 투고하시는 것을 권장해 드립니다. 교정을 받으신 이후 추가 수정을 하실 경우, 프리미엄 365일 무료 재교정을 이용해 수정파일을 최종 검토를 받으시기 바랍니다.(홈페이지에서 무료 재교정 조건을 참고부탁드립니다.)

▶ **Acknowledgement에 에디티지를 언급해도 될까요?**

여러 저자분들께서 에디티지 교정 서비스 이용 후 Acknowledgement 에 에디티지를 언급합니다. ICMJE 같은 유수 편집인위원회에서 제공하는 가이드라인을 보면 교정이나 writing에 도움을 받은 회사를 Acknowledgement에 언급하도록 명시되어있습니다. 또한 이러한 Acknowledgement의 언급은 저널에디터/리뷰어에게 논문의 영어가 철저히 검토되었으며 출판을 위해 요구되는 기준을 충족한다는것을 뒷받침합니다.

Acknowledgement에 에디티지를 언급하고 싶으시다면 간략하게 아래와 같이 명시하면 됩니다.  
  
We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.co.kr) for English language editing.

감사합니다.

에디티지 드림

|  |
| --- |
| **Additional notes** |

**Formatting**

Water now accepts free format submission:

*We do not have strict formatting requirements, but all manuscripts must contain the required sections: Author Information, Abstract, Keywords, Introduction, Materials & Methods, Results, Conclusions, Figures and Tables with Captions, Funding Information, Author Contributions, Conflict of Interest and other Ethics Statements. Check the Journal Instructions for Authors for more details.*

*Your references may be in any style, provided that you use the consistent formatting throughout. It is essential to include author(s) name(s), journal or book title, article or chapter title (where required), year of publication, volume and issue (where appropriate) and pagination. DOI numbers (Digital Object Identifier) are not mandatory but highly encouraged. The bibliography software package EndNote, Zotero, Mendeley, Reference Manager are recommended.*

*When your manuscript reaches the revision stage, you will be requested to format the manuscript according to the journal guidelines.*

1. Author information: Check notes in the Manuscript on missing information
2. In-text citations:
3. References: One reference is missing: Schölkopf, B. (2000)).

**Figures and tables**

1. Please refer to the suggestions on a separate file on how to improve the Figures and Tables in your manuscript.

|  |
| --- |
| **Editor’s report** |
| Dear Author,  Thank you for the opportunity to edit your manuscript. I agree with the previous edits that the manuscript is well-written. In this editing round, I focused on checking the grammar and ensuring that the manuscript adheres to MDPI's template for the journal Water. I also edited the journal abstract to meet the requirement of less than 200 words.  While I did not restructure the article, I noticed that the Figures require some attention. Please find my suggestions below to make the Figures more concise. It is important to note that although the journal does not specify a limit on the number of Figures, having more than 20 tables and figures might be considered excessive and would not meet the journal guideline on conciseness:  “Water has no restrictions on the length of manuscripts, provided that the text is **concise and comprehensive**.”  I recommend reviewing the Figures and considering the suggested revisions to streamline the presentation and enhance the overall readability of the manuscript.  Based on my assessment, I believe that your manuscript will benefit from one more round of editing prior to submission to the journal. I have provided feedback on your manuscript through specific comments along with ratings for relevant sections. The key below the table explains my ratings. I hope you find my feedback useful.  Best regards,  Editor |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Section | Rating |
| **Title**  An effective title is concise while being representative. | ★★ |
| **Abstract**  A good abstract explains the aims of the research, how these were met, and the main findings. | ★★★ |
| **Introduction**  This section should set the context for the study, clearly state the research objective, and establish the significance of the study. | ★★★ |
| **Materials and methods**  This section should completely describe all methods, techniques, and instruments used. This includes ethical considerations. | ★★ |
| **Results and discussion**  These sections should present the data and findings in a clear and unbiased manner, and address the objective or research question stated in the introduction. | ★★ |
| **Conclusions**  A good concluding section notes the limitations of the study. It should mention the scope for further research as well as the implications/application of the study. | ★★ |
| **Tables and figures**  The tables and figures should present data clearly, should be referenced in and correspond with the text. | ★ |

|  |
| --- |
| ★★★ This section required only a few revisions.  ★★ Most parts of this section required revision.  ★ The entire section required significant revision. Please go through my comments/changes carefully. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments** |
| **SCOPE**  Based on the content of the manuscript, it appears to adhere to the Aims & Scope of the journal Water. The study covers aspects of water science and technology, specifically in the area of harmful algal bloom prediction, which falls under the category of water quality. The manuscript also covers the use of machine learning algorithms, which is in line with the scope of water resources management and hydrology & hydraulics. Overall, the study's research areas align with the journal's aims and scope.  **NOVELTY OF THE STUDY**  The study's contribution to existing research is clearly highlighted in the introduction and discussion sections. The study aimed to address the limitations of previous studies on harmful algal blooms (HABs) by utilizing advanced statistical machine learning algorithms to classify dominant algae and analyze the relationship between environmental variables and HAB occurrences in two representative water supply sources in South Korea. The study's contribution to existing research lies in the utilization of advanced techniques and the focus on two specific water supply sources in South Korea, which could aid in the efficient management of water supply source quality by accurately classifying dominant algae occurrences. Furthermore, the study's results provided insights into the patterns of seasonal dominance and correlations between environmental variables and HAB occurrences, which could have implications for future research on HABs and water resource management.  **RELEVANCE AND CONTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY**  Based on the journal's scope, the topic of the study, which focuses on the efficient management of water supply sources by accurately classifying dominant algae occurrences, is highly relevant and of interest to the journal's readership. Harmful algal blooms can pose a threat to the quality of water supply sources, and accurate prediction of their occurrence is crucial for effective management.  The study's findings have strong implications for water resource management, particularly in predicting and managing harmful algal blooms. The use of statistical machine learning algorithms to classify dominant algae offers a new and efficient approach to monitoring water quality. The authors have also identified the best algorithms for classifying dominant algae at different survey sites, which can be used as a guide for future research.  However, the manuscript could benefit from a clearer discussion of the contributions of the study findings to the field at large or to society. The conclusion briefly mentions the potential for efficient management of water supply sources, but a more detailed discussion on the broader implications of the study's findings would strengthen the manuscript's contribution to the field.  **SUBMISSION READINESS**  The manuscript can be submitted after few revisions following some recommendations on improving the Figures and Tables.  **Title.** Please consider the following suggested revised title: “Evaluating statistical machine learning algorithms for classifying dominant algae in Juam Lake and Tamjin Lake, South Korea.”  The proposed title is more concise and informative, providing a clearer understanding of the study's focus. It emphasizes the comparison and evaluation of different statistical machine learning algorithms, which is the primary goal of the research.  **Abstract.** The edited abstract provides a clear and concise overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and findings. It effectively communicates the importance of accurately predicting dominant harmful cyanobacteria species and presents the use of machine learning algorithms as an efficient tool for managing water quality. The abstract highlights the unique environmental characteristics of each survey site and emphasizes the potential benefits of predicting dominant algae in advance to better prepare for water source contamination accidents. Overall, the abstract serves as a well-organized and informative summary of the study.  **Introduction.** The introduction effectively sets the context for the research on dominant algae classification in water supply source sites in Yeongsan and Seomjin river basins using statistical machine learning techniques. It highlights the importance of managing water quality in South Korea, the role of the algae alert system, and the impact of harmful cyanobacteria on human health and aquatic ecosystems. Additionally, the introduction discusses relevant studies that have used machine learning techniques to predict water quality parameters and identifies the gap in the literature, which this research aims to address.The research objective is clearly stated, focusing on accurately predicting dominant algae using various statistical machine learning algorithms to enable better water quality management. It also emphasizes the significance of considering diverse variables related to water quality and hydraulic and hydrological factors in achieving accurate predictions. Overall, the introduction provides an informative and coherent background that supports the purpose of the study and the methodological approach.  **Materials and Methods.** Although the previous peer reviewer thought the manuscript was good to submit, I have some concerns about the Materials and Methods section. It feels more like a literature review than a clear explanation of the methods used in the study. However, this is just my opinion as someone with a research background in chemical oceanography and environmental sciences. Ultimately, it will be up to the journal's peer review process to thoroughly evaluate the manuscript.  **Results and Discussion.** The researcher has done an impressive job with this study. However, I feel that the results and discussion sections lacks a discussion of the harmful algal bloom prediction, which I thought was the primary focus of the study based on the introduction. While the section provides a good overview of the patterns observed, it lacks deeper analysis and explanations for these patterns. It would have been helpful to see more ecological or environmental explanations for the observed correlations and trends in seasonality. The researcher only cited two papers for the discussion. As someone with more of an ecology background than a data analytics, I found this aspect of the discussion to be lacking. Overall, the study has great potential but could benefit from more detailed analysis and holistic explanations of the results.  **Conclusion.** The conclusion does highlight some limitations of the study, but it may be perceived as ending on a negative note. It would be helpful to balance the discussion by also emphasizing the positive aspects of the research, such as the successful application of statistical machine learning algorithms to predict dominant algae occurrences in two representative water supply sources in South Korea. Additionally, the conclusion could benefit from a clear statement on the implications of the research findings and how they may inform future water quality management efforts.  **Tables and Figures.** While the content of the Figures and Tables in the manuscript is valuable, their current format requires significant revisions. Combining multiple Figures and reducing the white spaces would make them more visually appealing and easier to interpret. I suggest that the author should consider revising the Figures and Tables to make them more concise and clear, thereby improving the overall readability of the manuscript. In addition, it would be helpful to avoid redundancy in the legends and axis labels of the figures and tables. This would not only improve the overall clarity of the visuals but also make them easier to interpret for the readers. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Quick tip** |
| **Guideline** |
| Correct Word Usage |
| **Explanation** |
| Correct word choice is important in scientific writing to ensure clarity and accuracy of the message being conveyed. |
| **Example** |
| Explanatory data analysis vs exploratory data analysis  Exploratory analysis is used to gain insight into the data, identify patterns and relationships, and generate hypotheses.  Error: An explanatory data analysis is performed to investigate the overall data’s characteristics before analyzing the data  Edit: An exploratory data analysis is performed to investigate the overall data’s characteristics before analyzing the data |