

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_104129
Title of the Manuscript:	IDENTIFICATION OF SIGATOKA LEAF SPOT DISEASE IN BANANA USING CONVOLUTIONAL NEURAL NETWORK (CNN)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 7elty**', 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.journalajaees.com/index.php/AJAEES/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is very important for scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is comprehensive but the outlines must be deleted.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. References are insufficient and 90% of them are recent but 10% of them is old.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Optional/General comments</p> <p>1. In the introduction, family, state, utilised and tonnes must be written Family, State, utilized and tones respectively.</p> <p>2- The introduction is long and must be abbreviated.</p> <p>3- Numbers of references which appeared in references list are absent or disappeared in the text.</p> <p>4- According to authors of references 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 which mentioned in the text, the full first name only of the author must be written before <i>et al</i> or the year.</p> <p>5- In references list the publication year of the second reference is absent while it is mentioned in the text.</p> <p>6- The publication year of the third reference is not identical to that mentioned in the text.</p> <p>7- In both references 6 and 7 the number of authors are two while in the text the word <i>et al</i> is mentioned.</p> <p>8- In references list the 10th reference must be written before the 9th reference according to their order in the text.</p> <p>9. Results must be compared with the results of previous researches.</p> <p>10- Results must be discussed</p> <p>11- Conclusions are long and must be abbreviated.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mukhtar Abdel Aziz Mohamed Osman
Department, University & Country	University of Dongola, Sudan