

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRCOS_104178
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Long-Range Wireless Area Network Enabled Smart Agriculture for Sustainable Food Production
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.journalajrcos.com/index.php/AJRCOS/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is good and much needed in the science community</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate for the content</p> <p>3. The abstract is ok</p> <p>4. Some subsections needs to be well structured. Ie. The citation of reference 8 -13 was inappropriate. In-text citation where made against a sub theme instead of its content. The Author need to address that.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is ok</p> <p>6. The reference is adequate</p> <p>7. Figure 1 was not properly referred to in discussion</p> <p>8. Table 2 and 3 were not referred to in the discussion</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Author should check how citation are made. You cannot just cite a word. Does that mean the word originate from that author? Please kindly check all your citations well.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Solomon Nii Nikoi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>AAMUSTED, Ghana</b>