

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Physical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_PSIJ_109343
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of connected objects (IoT) in the agricultural sector in Burkina Faso: approaches and perspectives
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is potentially important for the scientific community as it explores the application of IoT (Internet of Things) in the agricultural sector in Burkina Faso. IoT has the potential to significantly impact agriculture, and insights from this study could be valuable, especially in a country where agriculture is a crucial part of the economy. 2. The title of the article is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. 3. The abstract of the article provides a good overview of the study's main points, including the importance of IoT in agriculture and its potential benefits. However, it could be more concise and focused. 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript seem appropriate, but the paper would benefit from a clearer organization and a more logical flow of ideas. The content is somewhat scattered, and the paper could benefit from improved transitions between sections. 5. While the manuscript discusses the potential impact of IoT in agriculture in Burkina Faso, it lacks specific data, case studies, or empirical evidence to support its claims. The scientific correctness of the paper could be improved by providing concrete examples and data on IoT implementation in the agricultural sector in Burkina Faso. 6. The references provided are limited, and there is no specific list of references included in the text. It is essential to have a comprehensive list of references to support the claims made in the paper. Additionally, incorporating more recent references related to IoT in agriculture would enhance the paper's credibility and relevance. <p>Overall, the manuscript has potential significance, but it requires further development and improvement in terms of structure, evidence, and references to better serve the scientific community.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify the Research Objectives and Hypotheses: The paper lacks a clear statement of the research objectives and hypotheses. It would be helpful to explicitly state what the research aims to achieve and what specific hypotheses or research questions are being addressed. This will provide a more focused and structured approach to the study. 2. Expand on the IoT Implementation in Burkina Faso: While the paper discusses the importance of IoT in agriculture, it would be beneficial to provide more concrete examples and case studies of IoT implementation in Burkina Faso's agricultural sector. This will help readers better understand the practical applications and impact of connected objects in the context of Burkina Faso. 3. Methodology Section: The methodology section should be more detailed and include information on data collection methods, sample size, and data analysis techniques. Additionally, it would be helpful to discuss the limitations and potential biases of the chosen research methodology. 4. Definition and Classification of Connected Objects: The paper briefly touches upon the three types of connected objects (communicating object, intelligent object, object system) but could 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>benefit from a more in-depth discussion of these classifications and how they relate to the agricultural sector in Burkina Faso. Providing examples of each type of connected object in an agricultural context would enhance clarity.</p> <p>Incorporating these technical comments will help strengthen the paper's structure, clarity, and the depth of its analysis.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Chaitanya Vijaykumar Mahamuni
Department, University & Country	Fr. C Rodrigues Institute of Technology, India