

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_100958
Title of the Manuscript:	Legal personhood and robotics: birth of the smart android and of the biodroid
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.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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, this article brings up the idea of regulating robotics agents as part of the society and the related consequences that regulates their responsibilities</p> <p>No, you could better remove the "birth of smart android" because it is already there. Just keep everything else.</p> <p>No, authors need to address the exact outcome of their work. Be more specific on the resulted analysis.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, but they are not in correct form. They are not in IEEE format.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Authors need to reformat their references. All references must be in English. Reference number 6 is not written in English.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wrong way of citing references within the paper. Citing like [1],[3] is wrong. Instead say [1,2] - If the reference is not an article nor a book chapter then authors should find a way to indicate that. - Authors cannot just simply say "data taken from googlescholar" with a typo. Use proper way to cite such data and the figure. Such citation should involve the footnote of that page. 	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
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-Hussien Bin Talal University, Jordan