

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_89954
Title of the Manuscript:	Scientific communication on artificial intelligence: the question of the social status of the biodroid
Type of the Article	Short communication

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:

(<https://www.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Too long sentences throughout the paper. This distracts the reader and makes it difficult to understand what the authors are trying to say. - The main contribution/result is not clearly stated in the abstract. - The whole abstract needs to be rephrased. - The tendency to use informal language is obvious in this article. For example in page 1: "government have felt concerned", and this cannot be accepted. - On page 2: What do you mean by "communication" in the sentence "the aim of this communication.....". - Having a web link inside the text of the paper is not accepted as appears on page 2 and page 4. - On page 4. Authors are trying to break down some points but the way they are putting it is not understood. What do you mean by "for i)....." for ii)....." and so on. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - References format does not adhere to IEEE or any referencing format. - The flow of information is not smooth - More discussion on what has been already done in this particular subject has to be included. 	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Authors have very limited experience in writing professional articles. 	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tamer Abukhalil
Department, University & Country	Al-Hussein Bin Talal University, Jordan