

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_123386</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Weather Based Forewarning Systems for Important Pests and Diseases in Major Crops</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	The paper has high scientific impact for the community, as diseases and pests in crops are the major problems farmers facing now adays. It the article is properly written on this topic then it would have worth in scientific community. The diseases and pests effect the quality of the crop.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is according to the paper.	
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.	Abstract is AI written, which is the strong point for paper rejection. Once you have started working on a model, author should write abstract according to its model, background, proposed model, techniques used and findings. If you have done your work by yourself, it's easy to write abstract and other material of your model.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Paper structure is fine, but most parts of the paper is AI written and rephrased using tool. Paper should be written by the author. If its AI written then what is the contribution of the author in the paper.	
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.	The objective of the work is scientifically robust and technically sound if author will add more details in the article. There is no graphical representation of anything step of the model. No implementation details, in the case of review paper, there should be some tables that related the work with the previous work, and what are the contributions of the author in this work. Discuss each step of the model in detail and with its result and graphical representation. Its not possible to accept the paper in its current form.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient and properly mentions, but in some places there is problem in spacing.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammar is poor in some sections. English quality is better but need more improvements.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sunnia Ikram</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan</b>