

Peer Review of Group 10

Description of the topic, background/ related work, and identification of a knowledge gap

Very good. The concept of multi-drone missions is clearly described and three related works are briefly introduced (they could perhaps be described a little further). The knowledge gap seems highly relevant and clearly described.

Description of research problem, project aim, and research questions

Outstanding. The missing research on a holistic view of communication patterns is clearly described, and directly motivates the research questions. The research questions are clear, unambiguous, answerable, and well aligned to the problem.

Argument on the selected research method and analysis. Description of the application of the research method and analysis

Outstanding. The application of the research method is well explained.

“ Specific criteria related to the research topic were used to determine which studies to include and assess their quality” Maybe mention that the specific criteria is shown in subsection B

“ ... providing valuable insights and supporting evidence-based conclusions related to the research topic.” This sounds like you have already conducted the review and are concluding on how it went.

You probably already know but missing reference to appendix where extraction forms are.

Presentation of results and analysis and discussion

Outstanding. The paper has a clear presentation of the results, and follows a clear logical connection between RQ1, RQ2 and RQ3. Each is answered to perfection, and is also analyzed in depth. Moreover, the discussion both highlights the necessary topics, addresses and discusses these.

Disposition and layout of tables and figures. Use of referencing.

Outstanding. Consistent and everything is correctly named, numbered and referred to.

Some comments:

Page 4 is very table-heavy,

We're not sure if this is a requirement, but usually figure captions are below the figure, while table captions are above - currently both are above.

Language of the report

Very good. Coherent and mostly scientifically appropriate.

Some comments:

Avoid using "we", it's used multiple times throughout the report.

"While inspecting the extracted data, the authors" - you are not important. No need to mention that the authors did this or that, the important bit is that it was done.

A couple of minor grammatical errors,