

Review Form 2

Book Name:	Science and Technology: Recent Updates and Future Prospects
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2247
Title of the Manuscript:	Leap Motion Device Used to Control a Real Anthropomorphic Gripper
Type of the Article	BOOK CHAPTER

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)
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.	This manuscript adds significant importance for the scientific community as it contributes new insights in the LeapMotion using anthropomorphic gripper with five fingers. The results presented have many practical applications, contributing to the development of new approach in gripping process, further enhancing its impact on both science and society.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Exploring Leap Motion Device Used to Control a Real Anthropomorphic Gripper	
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.	Delete the first four sentences in the abstract because these sentences are not relevant in the abstract. I would suggest more details in the abstract, importance of the research as introduction, regarding methods, result and future direction of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Change the structure of the manuscript should converted into extended abstract format : introduction , literature (if any), methods, results, and conclusion.	
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.	The manuscript is well scientifically written. It follows accepted scientific protocols in the experimentation process, provides methods that can be duplicated, well-supported results, and presents conclusions. The use of appropriate mathematical methods/formulas and software applications further strengthens the validity of the results. The only thing to do is to reconstruct the structure of the manuscript to clearly identify the parts.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	Some of the references were not updated. Some were more than 10 years.	

Review Form 2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Patacsil, Frederick
Department, University & Country	Pangasinan State University, Philippines