

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_118355
Title of the Manuscript:	Application of Soil Testing Sensors in Agriculture: A Review
Type of the Article	

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

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy>)

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. However, it would benefit from providing more detailed information on the domain, including current and past work. It should emphasize the innovative aspects of applying sensor technology to address agricultural problems. Including specific details about the types of plants, suitable soil conditions, and optimal temperature ranges, along with a comprehensive list of sensors and their benefits, would make the research more valuable for researchers. This additional information would enhance the manuscript's usefulness and relevance, helping researchers apply the findings more effectively in their work.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. Update the Abstract as per changes in manuscript</p> <p>4. Need improvement: Add details of past work, including the methodologies applied, and compare them using common parameters.</p> <p>5. Its initial information needs to be updated.</p> <p>6. The paper is insufficient and needs to include more recent references. It currently relies on outdated sources; references from the last 5 to 10 years should be added to include related work.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>English language is ok</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All diagrams have been copied from external sources. They must be redrawn to ensure good quality visibility. Alternatively, reference numbers should be provided to indicate where they can be found in the reference list.</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:	Disha Deotale
Department, University & Country	MIT Art Design Technology University, India