

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a valuable contribution to the scientific community, helping to advance knowledge and practice in the field of precision agriculture. 2. Alternate - "Revolutionizing Agriculture: Innovative Techniques, Applications, and Future Prospects in Precision Farming" 3. The abstract is well-structured, providing a clear and detailed overview of the topic. The abstract contains 461 words, which is excessive; ideally, it should be trimmed down to around 200-300 words. 4. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No citations are marked, as the reference section lacks a list of papers. 2. Under the objectives section, the author could utilize "gaps identified" and cite the refereed papers. 3. Instead of titling it "Innovations in Precision Agriculture Techniques," consider using "Methodology." If feasible, the author can incorporate diagrammatic, flowchart, or mathematical explanations. 4. The literature review lacks coherence. I recommend placing "Applications of GPS and GIS in Precision Agriculture" within the literature review section, accompanied by appropriate citations. 5. The subsections are not appropriately categorized. 6. The alignment of the entire paper is missing, making it difficult to understand the main title and subsections beneath it. 7. It's advisable to utilize a table to compare all methods. This table should include serial numbers, method names, working principles, benefits, and their relevance to the case, with citations accordingly provided. 5. Need to modify the manuscript with above suggestions 6. The author has referenced papers from 2021; however, recent papers have not been included in the reference paper sections. 7. Referring to Tables 1 and 2, it is difficult to pinpoint the exact information being highlighted. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The author needs to enhance the following areas: spell check, word spacing, and grammatical accuracy.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Based on the reviewer's feedback, the author should focus on concise abstracts (200-300 words), clear alignment and formatting, and comprehensive citation and referencing, including recent papers. Additionally, clarity in titles and section headings, incorporation of explanatory elements like diagrams, and coherence in the literature review are essential. Finally, proper categorization of subsections, utilization of tables for comparison, and attention to language and grammar will significantly improve the manuscript's quality.</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:	Pranita Tambe
Department, University & Country	Savitribai Phule Pune University, India