

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_98321
Title of the Manuscript:	Smart Trash Collection System – An IoT and Microcontroller-Based Scheme
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:

(<https://www.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>The manuscript includes detailed information about the design and implementation of the system, as well as the results of testing or experimentation, it could be important for researchers and practitioners in the field of IoT, microcontrollers, and waste management.</p> <p>Based on the title, the manuscript appears to describe a smart trash collection system that utilizes both IoT (Internet of Things) technology and microcontrollers. So no need to change the title.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract is profound and comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, the sections and sub-sections are relatively appropriate.</p> <p>Yes, the manuscript is scientifically valid and experimented with simulated and prototype results.</p> <p>Ref 24 is outdated. Kindly try to include any new recent references.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Kindly check for any typo and grammar error with Language professionals	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	C. Suganthi Evangeline
Department, University & Country	Karunya Institute of Technology and Sciences, India