

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_122282</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Battery-Operated Power Weeding Machines: Advancements, Challenges, and Future Prospects</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 manuscript contributes significantly to the understanding of Weeding Machines. The work is relevant to the current scientific discourse, particularly in Weeding Machines. However, it could benefit from more detailed exploration of Weeding Machines .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, a more precise title could be "precise agriculture" This title might better capture the essence of the study's findings.	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but could benefit from the inclusion of precise agriculture of Weeding Machines. Specifically, the impact could be emphasized more.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The structure is logical and follows a coherent flow.	
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 manuscript is scientifically sound, with robust data and analysis. The methodology is appropriate for the study's aims.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are up-to-date and relevant.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript provides valuable insights into Weeding Machines. Consider expanding the conclusion to discuss smart and precise agriculture.	

#### **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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Review Form 3

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Po Jen Kuo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan</b>