

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_106870
Title of the Manuscript:	Overview of underwater robots for hull cleaning
Type of the Article	Review Article

### 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- Yes. The manuscript covers the key challenges facing underwater hull cleaning, such as adapting to complex surfaces, achieving strong adsorption, and improving navigation and positioning. Identifying these challenges helps guide future research efforts. The manuscript highlights the benefits of using hull cleaning robots over traditional manual methods, including improved efficiency, safety, and environmental impacts. This could motivate more research into automation technologies.</p> <p>2- Yes. 3- Yes. 4- Yes. 5- Yes. 6- Yes.</p> <p>The introduction could be expanded to provide more background context. The methodology section lacks detail on the number and types of studies reviewed. The conclusion is abrupt and does not synthesize takeaways effectively. The manuscript is a bit short for a comprehensive review paper. More depth is needed. The technical content has merit, but the writing, structure, and completeness need refinement. I would recommend major revisions to improve the quality before publication.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English could be improved in certain areas to meet scholarly communication standards: Some grammatical errors include incorrect article use (a vs. an), subject-verb agreement issues, missing words, etc. Careful proofreading is needed. Some sentences are long and complex. Breaking them into shorter, simpler sentences would aid readability.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Alaa Abdulhady Jaber
Department, University & Country	University of Technology, Iraq