

Peer Review

Review of: "Active Matter Flocking via Predictive Alignment"

Mazen Bahaidarah¹

1. The University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom

mass with the existence of measurement noise.

The reviewer appreciates the authors' efforts and has made some comments to enhance the work's scientific impact:

Comments:

- Please clearly mention some numbers or percentages to show how the results demonstrated good performance.
- In the introduction section, you need to clearly mention the main contributions of the paper.
- The literature review is not enough. You need to show other recent studies that are similar to your work.
- The method section must come first, then the results section, and after that, the discussion section. Make sure that you follow the correct order of sections to present your work.
- The captions of the figures are too long, especially for Figures 2 and 3. Try to make the captions concise and precise. Also, when you mention the letters {a, b,etc} of the sub-figures in the caption, it is better to put parentheses around each letter. For instance, in the caption of Figure 2, you can write the letters like this:indicated by (a) a sharp decrease..., (b) an increase in fluctuations..... (e) low polarization variance.....
- Check for typos, e.g., after the comma ',' you should start with a small letter, as you can see in the caption of Figure 2 (line 5).
- You should include a conclusion in your work and summarise your results as well as the future directions and limitations of the proposed work.
- It is preferred that you fix the way of showing the square roots in your equations.
- How confident do you think you can apply your work in real-world experiments?

- What is the label of the x-axis in Figure 5(a)?

Overall Evaluation: Weakly Accepted

Best wishes,

The Reviewer

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.