

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>Nowadays, the increase in food demand pushes us to increase research to fill the lack of food resources such as fish. These waters are subject to many adverse effects due to climate change, pollution associated with population growth and development, and increased demand for food production and other uses. Water is a challenge for the success of the aquaculture pond project. The quality of water in aquaculture ponds is a main factor in increasing the production of aquatic life. This gives this manuscript the originality and importance.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Innovation of a low-cost water quality monitoring system in aquaculture ponds</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 comprehensive and gives a clear idea of the research. The abstract is detailed, but it should not contain sub-headings, which should be eliminated and the paragraph order kept.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript respects research standards. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate and it's clear .</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 over all structure of the paper is clear and appropriate: introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion. The author followed an ideal and scientific reasoning, he presented a review of literature in Introduction, but still requires development to give more importance to this research by citing previous work. The results are statistically analyzed and this analysis was carried out correctly. The research approach is scientifically clear and well structured. The analysis of the data is carried out in a relevant manner, which proves the reliability of the results.</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 majority of references are recent; i suggest adding the following references: *Tumwesigye, Z., Tumwesigye, W., Opio, F., Kemigabo, C., & Mujuni, B. (2022). The effect of water quality on aquaculture productivity in Ibanda District, Uganda. <i>Aquaculture Journal</i>, 2(1), 23-36. *Hlordzi, V., Kuebutornye, F. K., Afriyie, G., Abarike, E. D., Lu, Y., Chi, S., & Anokyewaa, M. A. (2020). The use of Bacillus species in maintenance of water quality in aquaculture: A review. <i>Aquaculture reports</i>, 18, 100503.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language used is clear and correct. Well-structured scientific writing that meets standards, suitable for scientific communications</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The author has not cited studies that justify the influence of aquaculture pond water quality on production in terms of quantity and quality as well as the cost of losses caused by the degradation of the quality of water. This will give more importance to this research. No comparison between costs for the two methods. The future work should focus on developing an alarm system that signals deteriorating water quality. The author did not specify the cost of this method to justify its efficiency. What are the limitations of this research?</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:	Zuhair El Attaoui
Department, University & Country	Universite Ibn Tofail, Morocco