

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_124230
Title of the Manuscript:	Autonomous Vehicle Navigation: Integrating Fuzzy Logic Training with Neural Networks for Optimized Performance
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper presents a sound notion and might be advantageous for other researchers involved in autonomous vehicle navigation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	abstract should concise and focused on the key aspects—objective, methods, findings, and conclusion.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Document needs overall formatting such as justified alignments, different font used.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	1.The introduction lacks a clear focus and does not adequately introduce the main research problem. 2. In literature review a summarizing individual studies without drawing connections between them. 3.Concise explanation needed for the proposed methodology 4.A comparative reanalysis of results is necessary for experiment 1 and experiment 2.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	Try to organise it in an increasing sequence of years.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Poor Language	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Puja Gupta
Department, University & Country	Rajiv Gandhi Technical University, India