

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_112580
Title of the Manuscript:	AUTOMATED FISH FEEDER USING SCHEDULER MOBILE APPLICATION
Type of the 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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community as it depicts clearly how one idea could be transformed to even better ones. Yes, it is suitable but, it could be better. Some important aspects of the project should be captured in the topic. Example, "Design and construction of automated fish feeder using scheduler mobile application" could be used instead. Yes, it is. Yes, they are. Yes, it is. I think they are. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Well, there are some few flaws in the English quality, and I have pointed some out in the document I attached with this form. The corrections I made would be seen in red.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>In the conclusion/recommendations section, not even a single recommendation was actually written, and so I suggest that the word "recommendations" should be deleted out of the context. Still under that, i.e., in the content, it was written that the Smart Fish Feeder dispenses 1 kilogram of fish feeds every 1 minute. This is inconsistent with the data given in the table, under results. According to the data, 0.43kg of the feed is dispensed in 12 minutes and so, 0.03583kg will be dispensed per minute.</p> <p>Also, in this work, the researchers didn't really explain explicitly, the functions of some components in accordance with their specific functions in this project like; ultrasonic sensor and servomotor. And these components are really crucial to the effective functioning of the whole system.</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:	Sani Abdullahi Adamu
Department, University & Country	Nigerian Defence Academy, Nigeria