

Review Form 1.7

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

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Although the paper shows activities in the field of software and hardware the work is basically is totally applied document and not a scientific one)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (Development of software and hardware could be emphasized in the title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? It should improve</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? It does not have a clear structure</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Of course with a lot of improvements, especially in the field of the description of hardware and software</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>Acceptable (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The authors should improve the abstract and conclusion: Some quantitative results should be added in the abstract and conclusion. The paper does not have a clear structure, and the transition between different sections is not smooth. The conclusion of the paper provides recommendations but does not summarize the main points of the paper</p> <p>Figures should be modified, please try to improve the quality by reproducing some of the figures.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? English writing should be improved.</p>	Improvement of the quality of the figures by reproducing them is necessary.	
<p>Optional/General comments The paper could benefit from the addition of more detailed technical information and explanation of the AI models and their applications in the field.</p>		

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:	Mohammad Reza Hedayati
Department, University & Country	Iran Telecommunication Research Center, Iran