

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

Muzafer Saračević<sup>1</sup>

1 International University of Novi Pazar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- 1. The authors should add more details about their final results in the abstract.
- 2. One paragraph is needed to be added to the introduction to show the main contribution and how does it differ from the previous work. The author should add a paragraph at the end of the introduction section to describe the paper structure and sections.
- 3. Introduction may be improved, adding the highlights and the problem statements. You could improve writing, link better the ideas flow in the Introduction.
- 4. Review references because some of them are unstandardized. The difference between your proposal and related works is not clear, you could do details better. I suggest add a comparative table in "Literature Review" to contrast your solution in front of related works. You could discuss the relationship between your solution and past literature.
- 5. I miss a section that outlines the limitations of your approach and possibilities of extension. Are there any disadvantages or limits of your approach?
- 6. Authors need to confirm that all acronyms are defined before being used for first time.
- 7. Please expand the concluding considerations. Write some future directions in the conclusion section..
- 8. Improve the readability of the manuscript in terms of typos mistakes and errors. There are some grammatical errors and awkward phrasings (suggested proofreading the manuscript after addressing all comments to avoid any typo, grammatical, and lingual mistakes and errors).

Qeios ID: X43F1A · https://doi.org/10.32388/X43F1A