

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Engineering Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JERR_98594
Title of the Manuscript:	Forecasting of crop yield using remote sensing data, agrarian factors and machine learning approaches
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.journaljerr.com/index.php/JERR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is acceptable.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the manuscript could be improved.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The article has plenty of references.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The quality of the article is suitable. However, I would recommend to the authors to have an outsider read it and point out the typos and grammatical errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper was captivating and very interesting. I commend the author for a job well done! I would recommend the following modifications if I may.</p> <p>1. In the Abstract, there is no need to mention any Literature review. The abstract need to be very crisp and concise on what is the methodology, what are the findings, and what is future expansions if any.</p> <p>2. I love the figures and tables; however, the paper never talks about them. I would recommend after describing the graph, you mention "as shown in fig.1..." you need to guide the reader and tell him/her where to look.</p> <p>Having transition paragraphs to help the reader what to expect. Suddenly I saw numbering system but you did not explain what the numbering system is for.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seta Boghikian Whitby
Department, University & Country	University of La Verne, U.S.A.