# Review of: "Neuro-Fuzzy-Based Adaptive Control for Autonomous Drone Flight"

Silvio Simani[1]

1 University of Ferrara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

### Comments to the Authors

In the reviewer's opinion, the paper could have been more interesting and organised better. In general, the overall contribution remains scientifically poor and technically questionable. In more detail, the paper's title is quite clear, whilst its Abstract should have avoided using technical terms and technical details, which reduce its readability. The keyword list needs to be improved. Section 1 does not provide a sufficiently accurate overview and critical discussion of the state of the art of the related literature. As further remark, the end of Section 1 should not cite the paper's sections using the Roman numbering style. Section 3 should have been included in Section 1. should have suggested more details regarding the considered models and tools, especially regarding the uncertainty, disturbance, and model-reality mismatch. In fact, this point is fundamental when the proposed solutions have to be applied to safety-critical processes. On the other hand, Section 3 should have helped the reader understand the proposed methodology's effectiveness. In particular, it does not consider the reliability and robustness aspects of the proposed algorithms. Due to the remarked flaws, the achieved results analysed in Section 4 are simulations, and they do not represent experimental results. However, they do not highlight the effectiveness of the proposed solutions, especially concerning the robustness and reliability features of the developed methods, taking into account the unavoidable presence of uncertainty and disturbance effects, as well as the model-reality issue. The authors reported several pictures; however, more effective metrics and performance indices should have been considered for assessing the effectiveness of the developed schemes. Finally, Section 5 does not suggest effective open problems and future issues that could require further investigations. On the other hand, the use of acronyms and technical terms should have been avoided also here, as it should remain a stand-alone part of the manuscript.

### Comments to the Editor

In the reviewer's opinion, the paper could have been more interesting and organised better. In general, the overall contribution remains scientifically poor and technically questionable. Therefore, in the reviewer's opinion, the manuscript should not be considered for publication due to its minimal content and added value.