

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118793
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL AND MACHINE LEARNING ALGORITHMS IN PREDICTION OF BISWANATH CHARIALI DISTRICT TEA PRODUCTION
Type of the Article	

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it addresses the impact of climate factors on tea production, a critical agricultural sector in regions like Assam. The comparison between statistical and machine learning models for predicting tea yields provides valuable insights for agricultural scientists, data scientists, and practitioners in the field. The findings could guide the development of more accurate forecasting tools, which are essential for sustainable agricultural practices and climate change adaptation strategies.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable, but an alternative could be "Assessing Predictive Models for Tea Yield: A Statistical and Machine Learning Approach in Assam's Biswanath Chariali District."</p> <p>3. The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the study's aim, methods, results, and significance.</p> <p>4. The manuscript's structure and subsections are appropriate, following a logical and clear scientific format.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears scientifically correct based on the provided summary, but a full assessment would require detailed methodology and data analysis.</p> <p>7. The references seem sufficient and recent. However, including additional references on recent advancements in machine learning for agriculture and the socio-economic impacts of predictive modeling could enhance the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yixu Wang
Department, University & Country	School of Computer Science, Peking University, China