

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Research in Computer Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJRCOS_120353</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Synergizing Random Forest and K-Means Algorithms: An Analytical Study for Precise Crop Recommendation in Southeast Asia</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	After studying the manuscript thoroughly, it can be affirmed that this paper will play a pivotal role in the scientific community. The main focus of this article is to figure out the best-suited crops by analyzing the real-life data set through a machine-learning procedure. Two ML approaches are used, Random Forest Classification and K-Means Clustering, to find out the best output from a complex data set so that it could be enhanced in future.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is suited to the content and the concept of the paper.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is very good with the key concepts of the paper and I believe it could be enriched by adding some key points with numbers from the Results section. This will make the abstract more standard compared with the scientific research articles.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The clarity and standardization of the articles can be enhanced by dividing the "Experiment and Result" section into separate sections: "Experiment," "Results/Findings," and "Discussion." This structure will aid readers in understanding the content with greater ease.	
<b>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its rigorous methodology and comprehensive data analysis. The authors have employed a well-designed experimental framework, utilizing appropriate controls and replicates to ensure the reliability of their findings. Furthermore, the manuscript provides a detailed literature review which is situating the study within the broader context.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b>	In terms of this paper, the number of references which are added to this paper, are moderate enough.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the quality of the language of this article is standard enough to match with scholarly community.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**PART 2:**

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

**Review Form 3**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Md Mahfuzul Islam Shamim</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bangladesh</b>