

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123094
Title of the Manuscript:	A Low-Cost Embedded System for Continuous Water Quality Monitoring in Aquaculture Ponds
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community because it addresses the growing need for sustainable and cost-effective solutions in aquaculture, a field crucial for food security and economic development. The proposed embedded system offers a practical and affordable way to monitor critical water quality parameters in real-time, which can lead to improved fish health and higher productivity in aquaculture ponds. By demonstrating minimal error margins and validating the system against traditional methods, the study establishes a reliable and accessible tool that can be widely adopted in the industry. I appreciate the manuscript for its practical approach, the clear validation of results, and the potential impact on enhancing aquaculture practices, making it a valuable contribution to the field of environmental monitoring and agricultural technology.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, covering the key aspects of the study, including the aim, methodology, results, and conclusion. However, to enhance its clarity and completeness, here are some suggestions: Inclusion of Specific Results, Clarify Technological Integration.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it employs a systematic approach to the development and validation of an embedded system for water quality monitoring in aquaculture. The methodology is clearly described, including the integration of sensors for pH, temperature, and turbidity with an Arduino Mega microcontroller, which demonstrates a solid understanding of embedded systems and sensor technology. The results are presented with quantitative comparisons against traditional measurement methods, showing minimal error margins, and the use of statistical analysis further supports the reliability of the findings. Additionally, the study's use of a two-sample t-test to validate the accuracy of the system against standard instruments indicates a rigorous evaluation of the data, ensuring the conclusions drawn are both credible and based on empirical evidence.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript appear to cover a broad range of relevant topics, including water quality monitoring, sensor technology, and aquaculture practices. However, many of the references seem slightly dated, with several from the early 2010s or earlier. While foundational studies are important, the inclusion of more recent references from the last 5 years would strengthen the manuscript by aligning it with the latest advancements in embedded systems, IoT, and sensor technologies in aquaculture.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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:	Kokkula Shiva Prasad
Department, University & Country	India