

Review Form2

Book Name:	Scientific Research, New Technologies and Applications
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2504
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbon Responsible Signal Transaction in Molecular Nature of Sensory Protein: A Vision for Robot
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript discusses an innovative approach to understanding the role of carbon in sensory proteins, particularly in the context of robotic vision. The concept of carbon responsible signal transaction is intriguing and holds potential for applications in bioengineering and robotics. The manuscript could significantly contribute to fields such as protein engineering, bioinformatics, and artificial intelligence by providing insights into the molecular interactions involving carbon and their implications for signal transduction mechanisms.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Carbon Responsible Signal Transaction in Molecular Nature of Sensory Protein: A Vision for Robot," is suitable for the content presented. However, it could be refined for clarity and impact. A suggestion might be: "Role of Carbon in Sensory Protein Signal Transduction: Implications for Robotic Vision."	
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 provides a general overview but lacks specificity in detailing the results and implications of the study. It could benefit from a more concise summary of the key findings and their significance. Adding specific results and how they contribute to the field would improve the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is structured logically, but the flow could be improved. The introduction and methodology sections are well-defined, though the results and discussion could be more clearly delineated. The conclusion section is concise, but it should better highlight the broader implications of the findings.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a focus on a novel approach to understanding carbon's role in signal transduction in sensory proteins. However, the scientific rationale behind the selection of the sensory rhodopsin I and the specific methodologies used should be elaborated for clarity. The use of ICOD analysis is interesting, but the manuscript would benefit from a more detailed explanation of this technique and its validation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are adequate and relatively recent. However, it might be helpful to include more references that directly address similar studies or foundational theories in the field of bioinformatics and protein engineering.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the manuscript is generally suitable for scholarly communication but could benefit from a thorough proofreading to correct grammatical errors and improve clarity. The use of technical language should be balanced with explanations to ensure the content is accessible to a broader audience.	
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:	Mohan Gandhi Bonthu
Department, University & Country	Sandip University, India