

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_76192
Title of the Manuscript:	DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF IOT BASED UBIQUITOUS WEATHER STATION
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This paper seems to be related to the design of meteorological stations. However, there is no description that there were new discoveries or inventions in the content, or that there were advantages compared to other methods. As a judge, this text feels like a device manual. Looking at the charts in the latter half, it seems that there are some meaningful results, so it is recommended that you resubmit after rewriting the content drastically, keeping in mind that it is a paper as a whole. Just in case, the details I noticed are described in the section below.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract is an important part such as whether it makes sense to read this paper. I think it is better to describe the purpose of the research in an easy-to-understand manner and narrow down the content. - In the introduction, I think that the background of the research should be described, but I cannot read whether it is necessary to do the research. - I don't think Figs. 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8 are necessary. I don't understand what it means to post a photo. 	
Optional/General comments	<p>Again, I get the impression that this text is more of an instruction manual for a device than a dissertation. If you can't describe what is different from the others and what you are devising, I think you should not aim to publish it as a dissertation.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Jun Kobayashi</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Kochi, Japan</i>