

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAEES_122938
Title of the Manuscript:	Mobile Technology for Farmers: An Overview of Agricultural Apps
Type of the Article	Original Research 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

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>	
<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>In the introduction, the author should explain why they did it (motivation) discussing the possible outcome. Readers are primarily interested in the motivation and outcome of your research. Therefore, a good introduction should contain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What is the problem to be solved? Are there any existing solutions? Which is the best? What is the main limitation of the best and existing approaches? <p>* Add some quantitative findings in the abstract as well as in the conclusion section. * Introduction - Expand a little more to highlight the research problem to highlight the study's need. * The researcher should add a paragraph or more about the reasons that prompted them to do this work. * It is recommended to add comparison with the latest 23,22, or 21-year methods in this field, which is more convincing. * Please clearly highlight how your work advances the field from the present state of knowledge and you should provide a clear justification for your work which should be stated at the end of literature review/ related works. * The author needs to clearly explain the difference or improvement between the author's proposed method and the similar methods used to tackle the problem before. * It's quite unbelievable that the author did not state the amount of data used for experimentation. Or what type of data was used (primary or secondary?). * The industrial significance of the suggested strategy should also be included. * Need more clarity on the feature selection process. * Some of the challenges encountered during the study can be highlighted at the end of the conclusion. * Providing the computational cost and operational efficiency of the algorithm would have practical significance. * Use good quality figures, wherever applicable.</p>		
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</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>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</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>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>			
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		<p>* A "Discussion" section should provide a more compelling and argumentative analysis of the obtained results. * The discussion of the results should highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed approach.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		<p>* Results should be analyzed in a detailed manner. Some statistical tests and significant test should be included to verify the results. * Proofread the manuscript for any grammatical or typographical errors. Ensure that the notation and mathematical expressions are consistent and accurately represented throughout the manuscript. * In the conclusion section, the limitations of this study and suggested improvements to this work should be highlighted. Please provide a fair weakness and limitation of the model, and how it can be improved. * Authors need to double check Author Guidelines to make sure they submit the revised version in the right format.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Yousef Farhaoui
Department, University & Country	Ismail University, Morocco