

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_127953
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Assessment of Green and Red Lasers for Long-Distance Light Intensity Detection Using Light Dependent Resistors
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the wavelength-dependent performance of Light Dependent Resistors (LDRs), addressing a critical gap in the understanding of long-distance optical sensing systems. This study establishes a foundation for future investigations into the impact of environmental conditions on photodetector performance, aiding the advancement of resilient sensing technologies for aquatic and sediment-related research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, better to change the title as "Performance Evaluation of Green and Red Lasers in Long-Distance Light Intensity Sensing Using LDRs"	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, results, and implications. However, a few refinements could enhance its clarity and impact. Below are suggestions for improvement: Include a brief statement about why this comparison of green and red lasers is crucial.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Scientifically correct but very simple English.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference papers are not sufficient. Add latest reference paper. Ex: J. Yang et al., "Highly Uniform White Light-Based Visible Light Communication Using Red, Green, and Blue Laser Diodes," in IEEE Photonics Journal, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 1-8, April 2018, Art no. 8200508, doi: 10.1109/JPHOT.2018.2802933.(Example) Many papers are available in IEEE, Elsevier and reputed journals.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, The paper's literary style has to be improved.	
Optional/General comments	1. labeling should be there for the components in the figure. 2. Introduction should be illustrative. 3. Future research directions of the work are expected to be present.	

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:	Banka.Sujatha
Department, University & Country	Bvrit Hyderabad College of Engineering for Women, India