

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_96506
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of Automatic Fish Feeding Machine for Integrated Floating Cage Aquageoponic System
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)	1. Important, but please explain the benefits for cultivators such as in terms of cost, effective and efficient innovation 2. Okay 3 In writing an abstract, include an introduction, research objectives, methods used and research results with the number of words according to the guidelines of the journal, for example 150 -300 words and key words 4. Subsections according to the guidelines of the journal 5. There must be a total revision of the abstract, introduction, research methods, results and discussion. It is better if the results and discussion are discussed separately and in accordance with the writing guidelines of the journal 6. The references used are as good as the last 5 years. All of this is explained in the guide of the journal Suggestion; there should be a guide to writing articles. In the abstract there are keywords, for example 3-5 words	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the English language is in accordance with the grammar and words that are commonly used in scientific articles	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Marcelien Djablina Ratoe Oedjoe
Department, University & Country	Nusa Cendana University, Indonesia