

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Botany
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIB_125273
Title of the Manuscript:	The Growing Role of Artificial Intelligence in Plant Science
Type of the Article	Review

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, the quality of the manuscript is good and important for the scientific community, and the literature review is ok	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is well composed having relevance, clarity, and effectiveness	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, it pinpoints the key elements like its objectives and conclusions	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, it was well structured	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Yes, it is scientifically robust and technically sound. It pinpoints the key elements like its objectives and conclusions	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient and updated	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes, the language quality is good for scholarly communications	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	1. Consider splitting long paragraphs 2. If possible, please add some figure/graphical abstract representing the review 3. Please, give examples of each sub-category or in a tabular format	

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:	Lellapalli Rithesh
Department, University & Country	Kerala Agricultural University, India