

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_120762
Title of the Manuscript:	Studies on operational parameters of drone mounted sprayer to determine the application rate for herbicide application in crops
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The article concerns with study the operational parameters drone mounted sprayer to determine the actual application rate required. The experimental type of this presented work showed how to match between operational parameters to evaluate the application rate of herbicide rate on crops. This work is useful to enhance the methods of agriculture to reach the increase in food production around the world.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title looks good, but I can add my opinion to be written as Studies on operational parameters of drone mounted sprayer to determine the application rate for herbicide application in crops. So, I leave this to the author mind.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is fine, which is provided the information about how to study the operational parameters of drone mounted parameters. The most significant data where listed in this part. However, the study also focused on optimisation which are not referred or mentioned in the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Most of the subsection are written in good manner and then the structure of this work looks acceptable	
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.	As all results were obtained experimentally, that will help the reader to give its agreement and put this work to have sound. But the data may be not have high confidence as it recorded experimentally, and this permit to some error percentage while trying to fix data in all selected conditions. Which mean the needed for validity is important to confirm that?	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	I though that the references are written in good academic manner, and the number of references is acceptable	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	For the language, the article is written in acceptable language, but there are some mistakes during typing it. So, I suggest the author/ authors to revise the article and correct all any mistakes or typo error.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ziad Shakeeb Al Sarraf
Department, University & Country	University of Mosul, Iraq