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29-May-2025  
  
Paper:Sensors-90063-2025 Analysis and Experimental Validation of SSTDR for Simultaneous Distributed Diagnosis of Wire Networks  
  
Dear Dr. Addad,  
  
I am writing to you concerning the above referenced manuscript, which you submitted to the IEEE Sensors Journal.  
  
Based on the enclosed set of reviews at the bottom of this letter, your manuscript has received an "Accept, Subject to Mandatory Corrections" decision.  We hope you will be able to implement the comments of the reviewers.  
  
\*\* EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY \*\*  
  
All revised papers must have the changes highlighted or underlined so they are easy to see.  All revisions should also include a point-by-point response to each of the reviewer's comments.  This will help to speed up the final decision process for the editor.  
  
**When you are ready to submit your revision, visit the following link:**[**https://ieee.atyponrex.com/submission/submissionBoard/##EXTERNAL\_NO##/current?idtype=external**](https://ieee.atyponrex.com/submission/submissionBoard/##EXTERNAL_NO##/current?idtype=external)  
  
The deadline for your revision is 19-Jun-2025.  If this is not enough time, please request an extension by emailing [sensors-admin@ieee.org](mailto:sensors-admin@ieee.org) so that we will know when to expect your revision.  However, we recommend that you revise your current manuscript and return it within the time period specified.  In this case, the revision will go to the same Associate Editor and reviewers for re-evaluation.  
  
If you have any questions regarding the reviews, please contact the Associate Editor. Any other support related inquiries should be directed to Shivani Chauhan at [sensors-admin@ieee.org](mailto:sensors-admin@ieee.org).  
  
Sincerely,  
  
Dr. Nan Li    
[nan.li@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:nan.li@hotmail.co.uk)    
  
Shivani Chauhan  
[sensors-admin@ieee.org](mailto:sensors-admin@ieee.org)  
  
Editor Comments:  
  
Reviewer: 1  
  
Comments to the Author  
Dear Author,  
  
I really appreciate the time and effort you put into addressing all the questions raised by the reviewers.  
I believe colleagues working in the field could benefit from learning about this new ZCZ technique.  
However, although you mentioned that the typos I pointed out had been corrected, all of them are still present (labeled eqs 3, 7 and 14 in the previous version and 3, 6 and 12 in the current version).  
More concerningly, some equation numbers are now out of sync with their references in the text, and some equations even share the same number.  
  
Best regards,  
  
Reviewer: 2  
  
Comments to the Author  
1- the writing should be improved, figures are in low quality.  
2- How the wire electrical parameters can affect your method? with technology size can your method be affected?  
3- Please compare your method with 2025 refrences?  
           
Reviewer Comments:  
  
Reviewer: 1  
  
Recommendation: Publish in Minor, Required Changes (as noted in the Comments section. This rating may not be assigned for Sensors Letters.)  
  
Comments:  
Dear Author,  
  
I really appreciate the time and effort you put into addressing all the questions raised by the reviewers.  
I believe colleagues working in the field could benefit from learning about this new ZCZ technique.  
However, although you mentioned that the typos I pointed out had been corrected, all of them are still present (labeled eqs 3, 7 and 14 in the previous version and 3, 6 and 12 in the current version).  
More concerningly, some equation numbers are now out of sync with their references in the text, and some equations even share the same number.  
  
Best regards,  
  
Additional Questions:  
1. Is the paper technically sound? If no, why not?: Yes  
  
2. Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?: Yes  
  
3. How would you describe the technical depth of the paper?: Appropriate for the generally knowledgeable individual Working in the Field or a Related Field  
  
4. How would you rate the technical novelty of the paper?: Somewhat novel  
  
1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in these transactions?: Yes  
  
2. Is the topic important to colleagues working in the field?: Yes  
  
1. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?: Satisfactory  
  
2. Are the title and abstract satisfactory?: Yes  
  
title and abstract explanation:  
  
3. Is the length of the paper appropriate? If not, recommend how the length of the paper should be amended, including a possible target length for the final manuscript.: Yes  
  
length of the paper recommendation:  
  
4. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?: Yes  
  
5. How do you rate the English usage?: Satisfactory  
  
6. Rate the Bibliography?: Satisfactory  
  
1. How would you rate the technical contents of the paper?: good  
  
2. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?: slightly novel  
  
3. How would you rate the "literary" presentation of the paper?: totally accessible  
  
4. How would you rate the appropriateness of this paper for publication in this IEEE Transactions?: good match  
  
If you are suggesting additional references they must be entered in the text box provided. All suggestions must include full bibliographic information plus a DOI. **Please note: requiring primarily one’s own papers to be cited is considered to be citation coercion, an ethically questionable practice according to IEEE Publication Services and Products Board Operations Manual. It also violates the reviewer’s anonymity.** : [1] Distributed Reflectometry-based Diagnosis for Complex Wired Networks, N. Ravot & al. (2007)  
  
Would you recommend this paper for a Best Paper Award?: No  
  
  
Reviewer: 2  
  
Recommendation: Reject (Paper is not acceptable for the Sensors Journal. Author should be encouraged to submit to another journal.)  
  
Comments:  
1- the writing should be improved, figures are in low quality.  
2- How the wire electrical parameters can affect your method? with technology size can your method be affected?  
3- Please compare your method with 2025 refrences?  
  
Additional Questions:  
1. Is the paper technically sound? If no, why not?:  
  
2. Is the coverage of the topic sufficiently comprehensive and balanced?: Treatment somewhat unbalanced, but not seriously so.  
  
3. How would you describe the technical depth of the paper?: Suitable for the non-specialist  
  
4. How would you rate the technical novelty of the paper?: Somewhat novel  
  
1. Is the topic appropriate for publication in these transactions?: Perhaps  
  
2. Is the topic important to colleagues working in the field?: Moderately  
  
1. How would you rate the overall organization of the paper?: Could be improved  
  
2. Are the title and abstract satisfactory?: Yes  
  
title and abstract explanation:  
  
3. Is the length of the paper appropriate? If not, recommend how the length of the paper should be amended, including a possible target length for the final manuscript.: Yes  
  
length of the paper recommendation:  
  
4. Are symbols, terms, and concepts adequately defined?: Yes  
  
5. How do you rate the English usage?:  
  
6. Rate the Bibliography?: Unsatisfactory  
  
1. How would you rate the technical contents of the paper?: good  
  
2. How would you rate the novelty of the paper?: slightly novel  
  
3. How would you rate the "literary" presentation of the paper?: partially accessible  
  
4. How would you rate the appropriateness of this paper for publication in this IEEE Transactions?: good match  
  
If you are suggesting additional references they must be entered in the text box provided. All suggestions must include full bibliographic information plus a DOI. **Please note: requiring primarily one’s own papers to be cited is considered to be citation coercion, an ethically questionable practice according to IEEE Publication Services and Products Board Operations Manual. It also violates the reviewer’s anonymity.** : د  
  
Would you recommend this paper for a Best Paper Award?: Yes