

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_118335
Title of the Manuscript:	Innovations in Precision Agriculture: Techniques, Applications, and Future Directions
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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. Yes, this manuscript is important for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive review of the innovations, applications, and future directions in precision agriculture, a rapidly evolving field that has significant implications for sustainable food production, resource optimization, and environmental conservation.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title "Innovations in Precision Agriculture: Techniques, Applications, and Future Directions" accurately reflects the content and scope of the review article.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract provides a concise yet comprehensive overview of the key aspects covered in the review, including recent innovations, applications, challenges, and future prospects of precision agriculture.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are well-organized and appropriate. The review systematically covers the essential components, such as innovations in techniques, applications, challenges, and future directions, making it easy for readers to follow the progression of the topic.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript appears to be scientifically correct and well-researched. The authors have provided a thorough review of the current state of precision agriculture, backed by relevant references and scientific evidence.</p> <p>6. The references provided are generally sufficient and cover a wide range of relevant sources. However, I would suggest including a few additional recent references to further strengthen the review, particularly in the sections on emerging technologies and future directions: Liakos, K. G., Busato, P., Moshou, D., Pearson, S., & Bochtis, D. (2018). Machine learning in agriculture: A review. <i>Sensors</i>, 18(8), 2674. Tsouros, D. C., Bibi, S., & Sarigiannidis, P. G. (2019). A review on UAV-based applications for precision agriculture. <i>Information</i>, 10(11), 349.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, coherent, and follows academic conventions.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The review article is well-written, comprehensive, and provides a valuable overview of the current state and future prospects of precision agriculture. The authors have done an excellent job in synthesizing the latest innovations, applications, and challenges in this field, making it a valuable resource for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers alike.</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:	Po Jen Kuo
Department, University & Country	National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan