

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_102837
Title of the Manuscript:	Unlocking Productivity Potential: The Promising Role of Agricultural Robots in Enhancing Farming Efficiency
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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>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. The manuscript is very important for scientific community. The manuscript is very timely, informative, and comprehensive.</p> <p>2. The title of the article suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references sufficient and recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language/ English quality of the article is excellent!</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I commend the author on all the research done to produce such an excellent article. It was such a pleasure reading the article. The research was very comprehensive and well presented. If I were to recommend couple of points of improvements, I would say:</p> <p>1. I know you address the workforce shortage and this technology will close the gap. However, addressing that this technology will take the jobs of the current workforce. Some sort of recommendations on how should we retrain the people who work in the farms if we were to take their jobs away? May be some government initiatives, etc.</p> <p>2. In the conclusion, you may expand a bit and address future research recommendations.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seta Boghikian-Whitby
Department, University & Country	University of La Verne, USA