

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_97401
Title of the Manuscript:	AUTOMATION AND DIGITIZATION IN THE SEED SECTOR: OFFLINE TO ONLINE
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	This paper introduces automation and digitization in the seed sector: offline to online. Overall, the manuscript has aided in closing the gap between seed production and yield in terms of both quality and quantity referring to automation and digitization in the seed sector Comments to be addressed before the article can be considered for publication along with is enclosed below: 1. The abstract must have precise quantification. It reads vaguely about efficiencies over prior works. The authors must put the benchmarks carefully and quantify the performance needs a major revision here. 2. Each acronym should be explained the first time it appears in the text, even if it appeared in the abstract. Check all abbreviations in text: each word should start with capital to explain an abbreviation. 3. suggest the authors to provide a comparative analysis of the various techniques/ methods used to claim the outcome of the said article, where there is a small confusion. 4. Redraft all the titles and contents appropriately. 5. The experimental results can be more organized to validate the theoretical ideas – Need a clarity in this section. Redraft the conclusion addressing the result findings appropriately. Also, include at least one future scope to it.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The grammar and syntax of many sentences are incorrect containing numerous grammar mistakes, which should have been easily detected and corrected by more careful and thorough proof-reading.	
Optional/General comments		

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khalid Nazim Abdus Sattar
Department, University & Country	Majmaah University, Saudi Arabia