Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_110383**
Title of the Manuscript:	**BICYCLE AUTOMATIC HEADLIGHT INTENSITY CONTROLLER**
Type of the Article	**Research Paper**

Review Form 1.7

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 **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**Yes. But more work is needed.** **It can be improved.** **If some statistical results can be included in the paper and the abstract, it would be nice.** **It should focus on contributions made by the authors.** **Yes** **Most of the references are old.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	There are many grammatical errors in the manuscript. Please check and improve.	
Optional/General comments	Please find the detailed comments as follows: 1. The pixel quality of most of the figures is very poor. Authors should try to improve the quality of all figures. Also, authors should try to put more information in these figures to make them more comprehensive. 2. As this is a research paper, the authors should try to avoid words such as project. It is more like an engineering project work, not a research paper. 3. The literature review is very short and involves very few papers. Authors should try to include a greater number of papers to make it more impactful. 4. Authors should clearly state what are the research gaps based on the conducted literature survey. 5. The captions of the figures are not proper. It should be explanatory. Putting a single-word caption is not acceptable. 6. Figure 4 and Figure 5 have the same caption. It should be different. 7. In Table 1 it is stated as "f (n=20)" but the summation of two entries is 15 not 20. Please check. 8. The writing style is poor. Authors should reduce the content which is already known or readily available on the internet. 9. Authors can conduct some ablation studies to make the experimental results section effective.	

Review Form 1.7

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Rakesh Chandra Joshi**
Department, University & Country	**Amity University, India**