

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123023
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhanced tobacco yield prediction using spatial information and exogenous variable-driven machine learning models
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript makes a significant contribution to the field of remote sensing applied to agriculture by providing a detailed analysis of intelligent methods and emerging remote sensing technologies for estimating crop health and productivity. The study addresses gaps in existing research by offering a comparative evaluation of remote sensing models and identifying current limitations and challenges. The authors demonstrate a deep understanding of the field and apply advanced technical solutions that are undoubtedly relevant for monitoring and optimizing other agricultural crops. This work can serve as a foundation for future research and for the development of more effective crop monitoring methods, directly impacting agricultural yield optimization and economic decisions in the agricultural sector.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the paper is relevant and comprehensively reflects the content addressed.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is well-structured and fully reflects the content of the article, covering the location, source, and type of data, as well as the methods and final results. However, it may be beneficial to add specific details about the innovative contributions of the research or the practical significance of the results obtained. Additionally, a brief mention of the challenges or limitations encountered in the study could provide a more complete image of the research impact.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The paper is well-structured and meets the standards of a scientific work.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript appears solid from both a scientific and technical standpoint, with a well-founded methodological basis and the use of relevant and diverse data. The analysis methods are clearly described, and the interpretation of results is clear and justified. However, to further strengthen the study's validity, it would be helpful to mention any potential errors or uncertainties associated with the methods used and how these were addressed in the analysis. This would ensure greater transparency and enhance confidence in the presented conclusions.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are relevant and recent. Although some older works are cited, they are relevant to the context studied.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>As the article was presented, there are some minor revisions needed to correct a few grammatical and stylistic errors such as missing articles and vague references, i.e. it's not clear exactly to what the word refers to. This is mostly prevalent in the beginning, later sections improve on this aspect.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>However, I believe that the choice of tobacco as the focus crop, while technically impressive, is questionable from an ethical and social perspective. Tobacco is a crop directly associated with a vice that negatively impacts human health. In a world where we face significant challenges related to population growth and demographic aging in many regions, it would have been more appropriate for these advanced technologies to be applied to studies of crops essential for feeding the population.</p> <p>Although the article is excellent from a technical and methodological standpoint, I believe that the applicability of this research would be better directed towards agricultural crops that directly contribute to global food security.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Ion Ganea
Department, University & Country	Technical University of Moldova, Republic of Moldova