

[Review Form 2](#)

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Book Name:               | <a href="#">Contemporary Research and Perspectives in Biological Science</a> |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_BPR_3798  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | BIOELECTRONIC INTERPRETATION OF HUMAN COGNITIVE PROCESSES                    |
| Type of the Article      | Book chapter   |

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.                        | The manuscript is interdisciplinary in nature and novel in a contemporary academic parlance.   |   |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  | Good title   |   |
| 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.   | Satisfactory   |   |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  | The subsections are appropriate but the overview of the discourse should be presented at the introduction section rather than just bumped into the subsections.  |   |
| 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 will be robust scientifically and technically sound should all the definitions, descriptions and explanations of the bioelectronic jargons be reduced and be more focused and explicit on its interpretations and relevance to human cognitive processes. |   |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.   | The references are not sufficient for the write-ups and many are not recent. The author needs to work on this.   |   |
| Minor REVISION comments<br><br>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?  | The grammar is quality but should avoid the use of personal pronouns and abbreviation of words. Also, some corrections, that deal with grammar, have been noted in the body of the manuscript.   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments  | The article is scientific should it address all the corrections pointed out.   |   |

**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:                            | Akeem Ayodeji Adigun      |
| Department, University & Country | Arden University, Germany |