

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_98549
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Crop Yields through Machine Learning-Based Prediction
Type of the Article	

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment
<b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? 2. Is the title of the article suitable? 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	YES YES Abstract needs a re-write Subsections are not detail Needs more mathematical expressions in the methodology section that favours machine learning modelling (ex. KNN/Bayes should accompany their respective mathematical modelling.) References are drastically missing (in Introduction, reference starts with [5], where is [1] to [4]?)	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Needs a re-write	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>	1) Introduction and literature should contain more precise citations. Not sufficient 2) Methodology should be more specific. It starts with something that can be well written in the introduction section. 3) Conclusion should come up with numeric findings (if any) 4) Section IV should start with writing something before the bullet points begin. 5) Figures should be clearer. 6) Figure 2 should be followed by some writings below it. 7) There is no talking about the figures in the paper. They should be explained (referred somewhere in the writings.)	

### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khandaker D Islam
Department, University & Country	Royal University of Bhutan, Bhutan