

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Advances in Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AIR_101041</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Smart Aquaponics System for Oreochromis niloticus Production</b>
Type of the 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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? Ans: Looks good to me.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Ans: Yes.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form Ans: Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>For detail information can Author(s) refer manuscript for the comments?</p> <p>1) Can Author(s) use all images, block diagrams, tables in centre format?</p> <p>2) Can Author(s) use font size as 14 so that it will be easy to the readers?</p> <p>3) "Table 1 - Performance Comparison of the State of the Literature" is hard to read. Can Author(s) make It bigger table and font and remove blur?</p> <p>4) Can Author(s) correct sentences in page 4?</p>	

**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:	Manu Mitra
Department, University & Country	University of Bridgeport, USA