

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_128116
Title of the Manuscript:	DRONES IN AGRICULTURE: A SUMMARY
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript significantly advances the scientific understanding of how drone technology can revolutionize precision agriculture. By providing an in-depth analysis of the various applications of drones in crop monitoring, pest management, and spraying, it highlights their potential to enhance agricultural efficiency and sustainability. The paper offers valuable insights into the integration of UAVs with advanced sensing technologies, which can lead to more informed decision-making and reduced environmental impact. Overall, this research contributes to the growing body of knowledge on smart agriculture and underscores the importance of technological innovations in addressing global agricultural challenges.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Perfect</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, as it clearly outlines the focus of the research on the use of drones in precision agriculture. It highlights key areas such as aerial remote sensing, crop monitoring, and pest management, providing a concise overview of the topics discussed in the manuscript. However, there are a few areas where additional detail or clarification could enhance the abstract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify the specific benefits: While the abstract mentions that drones help reduce environmental pollution and improve health safety, it could more explicitly state how drones contribute to these benefits, such as by reducing pesticide use or increasing precision in field operations. 2. Mention technological advancements: The abstract could briefly mention the technological advancements in drone capabilities, such as AI integration, real-time data processing, and the use of multispectral cameras, which are discussed in the manuscript. 3. Include future implications: A mention of the broader implications of drone technology in agriculture, such as its potential to support sustainable farming practices and improve crop yields, could provide a clearer understanding of the long-term significance of the research. 4. Avoid redundancy: The mention of "aerial remote sensing" and "drones" is repeated in slightly different contexts. The abstract could be streamlined to avoid repetition while maintaining clarity. <p>Overall, I suggest adding more specific details on the technology's impact and future potential while reducing any redundant phrases.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>correct</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>sufficient</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Here are some specific observations and suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarity and Precision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some sentences are long and complex, which could make them difficult to follow. Breaking these into shorter, more concise statements would improve readability. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current: "The use of renewable energy sources and the preservation of the environment and natural resources are also motivated by ecological concerns." ▪ Suggested: "Ecological concerns drive the use of renewable energy sources and the preservation of natural resources." 2. Consistency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The terms "precision agriculture" and "smart agriculture" are used interchangeably, but they could be defined more consistently to avoid confusion. It might help to choose one term and use it throughout, or clarify early in the text how they are related or distinct. 3. Technical Jargon: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ While the article is aimed at a scientific audience, some sections contain jargon that could be clarified for wider accessibility. For instance, terms like "vegetation indices" or "Crop Water Stress Index (CWSI)" might benefit from brief explanations or definitions, especially if the intended readership includes those less familiar with specific agricultural technologies. 4. Grammar and Syntax: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are a few grammatical and syntactical issues that can be polished for smoother flow. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current: "Drones are used in aerial remote sensing, which measures vegetation indices and uses images of various wavelengths to identify various crop conditions." ▪ Suggested: "Drones are used in aerial remote sensing to measure vegetation indices and capture images in various wavelengths, which help identify crop conditions." 5. Passive vs. Active Voice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are instances of passive voice that could be switched to active voice for a more engaging and direct style. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current: "The use of drone-borne sprayers in the field has increased coverage..." ▪ Suggested: "Drone-borne sprayers increase coverage in the field..." 6. Minor Typographical Errors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some minor typographical or punctuation errors, such as missing commas or inconsistent use of hyphenation ("smart and precision agriculture" vs. "smart and precision-agriculture"), can be corrected to maintain a polished academic tone. <p>Overall, the article is suitable for scholarly communication but would benefit from minor revisions for clarity, consistency, and flow to ensure the language meets the standards of academic writing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the growing role of drones in precision agriculture, but some improvements could enhance clarity and depth. The introduction could better connect the challenges in agriculture with the specific solutions drones offer, emphasizing their impact on efficiency, cost reduction, and sustainability. A more structured review of the literature, organized by drone applications, would improve readability. Adding figures or tables to visually summarize key points, such as drone types or workflow models, could make the paper more engaging. A brief discussion on future trends, such as AI integration, would be useful in the conclusion. Expanding on drones' contributions to sustainability, such as reducing pesticide use and improving resource efficiency, would strengthen the manuscript's relevance.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Redoyan Chowdhury</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>International American University, USA</p>