

# Review of: "Can artificial jellyfish be the next pragmatic autonomous self-deployable actuator?"

Antonio López-Díaz<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Castilla La Mancha

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

First of all, I like the topic of the article and the author's intention of shedding light on the matter.

My major concern is that, after reading the abstract, I expected a deeper discussion on the gap between theory and pragmatic applications. However, I do not feel like I have read answers (or problems) to this challenge, but instead a typical review/perspective on underwater soft robots. I am not saying this is a bad text, but, for example, the author exposes three questions (section 2) about an important lack of knowledge that needs to be solved to achieve real applications, but then these questions are not discussed. Instead, the author focuses on the features of Jelly-Z, comparing this robot with animals and other soft robots, giving a large list of technical data (cost of transport, mass, speed, etc.). Nonetheless, what do we need for underwater applications? Of course, low cost of transport, higher speed, low noise... But what are acceptable values? Which are the values exhibited by the traditional robots that have been used for those tasks? I think there is a lack of contextual framework to really understand how far we are from the goal.

In the end, given the type of article and the freedom offered by Qeios, I was hoping for something more informative and clearer, even for non-specialized readers, delving into the key concepts and highlighting the key answers or problems to bridge the gap between theory and real applications in soft robotics. On the other hand, the article talks about some of the most outstanding underwater soft robots, so it is a good reference to scientists interested in this specific area.

Finally, some minor editorial concerns that I think should be improved to enhance the experience for the reader. For example, I like units separated from numbers, I think it is easier to read. Take care of some misspelled words (e.g., "Conclussions" in title of section 4). Some paragraphs are bad distributed, for example, at the end of section 3, in which "The section culminates..." should appear in other paragraph.