

Review of: "Tweeting AI: A Machine Learning Approach for Bird Species Detection and Classification"

Chuen-Horng Lin¹

¹ National Taichung University of Science and Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The authors propose a machine-learning method in this study to identify bird species from images automatically. While the research aims to address an exciting topic, the methods presented in the paper are all existing technologies, and the research objectives are limited to problems already solved in earlier studies. As a result, there is a significant lack of novel research challenges. Within the domain, these methods do not offer new insights or innovations and fail to surpass the boundaries of existing research findings. Consequently, the value and significance of this study are relatively low, making it challenging to attract widespread attention and interest in the academic community. Therefore, I cannot recommend accepting this paper for publication due to the following reasons:

1. The proposed methods lack originality and fail to address significant research challenges. To enhance the academic contribution of the research, it is suggested to explore more forward-looking and challenging research directions in the project's future development.
2. The paper lacks novelty and main contributions. The authors should highlight the novel ideas in the algorithm to achieve the necessary quality for publication.
3. The writing needs improvement; the current version is difficult to follow and is far from ready for publishing, making it impossible to evaluate correctly.
4. The paper needs a professional rewrite to meet the "Qeios" standard.
5. In the "Abstract" section, the authors should adhere to the standard structure of summarizing the significant aspects of the entire paper in about 500 words or less. This should include: (1) the overall purpose of the study and the research problem; (2) the basic design of the study; (3) significant findings or trends; and (4) a summary of the study's interpretations and conclusions. Additionally, the authors should provide 5-6 suitable single-word keywords for better online search visibility.
6. In "1. Introduction," the authors should follow the "introduction formula" for a more structured and clear introduction. The six ordered components are as follows:
 - a. General Background: Introduce the general area of science in which the project takes place, highlighting the current understanding of the system.
 - b. Specific Background: Narrow down to the sub-area that the paper addresses, and again highlight the extent of our understanding in this sub-area.
 - c. Knowledge Gap: Articulate what is not known, specifically focusing on the question that has motivated the work. This question should be a logical next step, given the background information.

- d. Literature Review: Review pertinent literature to orient the reader.
 - e. Brief Methods and Findings Summary: Briefly summarize the methods and key findings.
 - f. Contribution Description: Provide a clear, concise, and understandable main contribution of the paper within a maximum of 350 words.
7. The article's writing style and organizational structure do not meet the level and standards required for publication in a journal.
8. The paper lacks an adequate number of references, and the authors should carefully check the accuracy and completeness of all references, especially conference proceedings, ensuring that the conference location, date, publisher's name, and location are verified.
9. The language and grammar require improvement. Authors should seek help from native English speakers or professional editors to revise the manuscript.
- To improve this paper's quality and potential acceptance, the authors must address these issues thoroughly and make the necessary revisions.