

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

Yunfei Guo<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

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

This article appears to serve as an introduction and discussion of a recent study. However, I find the content quite confusing, and I recommend substantial revisions to address the following questions:

**What is the novelty?** The article lacks the introduction of any new hardware, software, or algorithms. It is crucial to clearly articulate the novelty in both the title and abstract. Highlighting the innovative aspect will provide readers with a clear understanding of the unique contributions of the study.

**Is this a literature review?** If the intent is to present a literature review, explicitly stating this in the title and abstract is essential. Additionally, the article should encompass not only the specific focus, such as "jellyz," but also incorporate a comprehensive overview of all recent research in the relevant field. Creating tables to compare the performance of various designs will enhance the quality of the literature review.

**Require experiments or supporting arguments:** To strengthen the article, it is imperative to include experiments or provide robust supporting arguments. This could involve incorporating empirical evidence, case studies, or relevant examples to substantiate the claims made in the study. Demonstrating the practical application of the discussed concepts will enhance the credibility and impact of the article.

In summary, a revised version should clearly communicate the novelty, explicitly state whether it is a literature review, and include experiments or compelling arguments to bolster the content. These adjustments will contribute to the clarity, coherence, and overall quality of the article.