

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_112886
Title of the Manuscript:	Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems for Precision Agriculture: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Paper

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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Manuscript Importance: The manuscript provides a comprehensive review of remote sensing and GIS in precision agriculture. It compiles existing research and presents an overview of the technological advances in the field. This is valuable for consolidating knowledge and guiding future research directions. However, the manuscript could benefit from a more critical analysis of the literature, addressing the limitations and potential biases in the current body of work.</p> <p>Article Title: The title is suitable as it accurately reflects the content of the review. It is straightforward and indicative of the comprehensive nature of the review.</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract is comprehensive, covering the key points of the review. It could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the implications of the findings for future research or practice in the field.</p> <p>Manuscript Structure: The structure is generally appropriate but could be improved for better readability. Subheadings and transitions between sections need to be more distinct to guide the reader through the narrative effectively.</p> <p>Scientific Correctness: The manuscript appears scientifically correct, but there are instances where assertions are made without adequate critical analysis or discussion of the limitations of the referenced studies.</p> <p>References: The references are sufficient and recent. However, the manuscript would benefit from including more studies that offer contrasting views or challenge the dominant perspectives in the field.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of English in the article is generally good but requires minor revisions for grammatical errors and sentence structure to meet scholarly communication standards.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The paper would benefit from the inclusion of a section on the socio-economic barriers to technology adoption in precision agriculture, especially in developing countries.</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:	Jayedi Aman
Department, University & Country	University of Missouri, United States