

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Agriculture</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJA_121739
Title of the Manuscript:	Precision cultivation of vegetable crops to increase productivity: A review
Type of the Article	Original Research

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<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)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Precision cultivation of vegetable crops is crucial for addressing the growing global food demand while minimizing environmental impact. By optimizing resource use and improving crop yields, this approach offers several significant benefits: Increasing Vegetable Productivity and Optimizing Resource Utilization</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title is relevant however there is a need to tell the readers what type of review it is. Is it a systematic review, scoping review or narrative review</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The provided abstract for the precision cultivation article isn't entirely comprehensive based on the traditional abstract structure (introduction, aim/objective, methodology, results/findings, conclusion, contribution)</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> The abstract does provide a brief introduction to precision cultivation and its aims, but it lacks more detailed background information on the context and importance of the topic.</p> <p><b>Aim/Objective:</b> The abstract does not explicitly state the specific aim or objective of the review article.</p> <p><b>Methodology:</b> The abstract does not mention the methodology or approach used in the review e.g. PRISMA, the databases searched, selection criteria, or analysis methods, and the number of articles in the final review.</p> <p><b>Results and Findings:</b> The abstract presents some of the key findings and aspects of precision cultivation, but it does not provide a clear summary of the main results or conclusions drawn from the review.</p> <p><b>Conclusion:</b> The abstract lacks a clear concluding statement that summarizes the overall significance, implications, or takeaways from the review.</p> <p><b>Contribution:</b> The abstract does not explicitly highlight the contribution or novelty of the review in the context of existing literature on the precision cultivation of vegetable crops.</p> <p>While the abstract does a good job of covering the various techniques and components of precision cultivation, it falls short in providing a comprehensive overview that aligns with the standard structure of an abstract. To be considered fully comprehensive, the abstract should include all the standard sections, such as a clear introduction, specific aim/objective, description of the methodology, summary of the key results and findings, a concise conclusion, and a statement on the article's contribution to the field. There is also a need to Quantify results: Mention the average yield increase or quality improvements achieved through precision cultivation.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections need to be restructured based on methodology, results and discussion,</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The subsections are relevant however since this is a review there are missing components such as the methodology used. There is also a need for a results section and a discussion section. Furthermore, the theoretical and practical implications should be highlighted. There is a need for this review to also provide its contribution, recommendations for future research, and its limitations. As is, this article lacks scientific rigor</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p>-</p>	<p>The references are based on literature from 1996 to 2022. Recent references in 2024 are expected. Without the authors specifying their inclusion criteria of articles based on years, it is difficult to comment on the relevance of articles from 1996. There is a need for the study to scope in articles from 2020-2024</p> <p><a href="https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2772375524000017">https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2772375524000017</a>  <a href="https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/plant-science/articles/10.3389/fpls.2024.1357153/full">https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/plant-science/articles/10.3389/fpls.2024.1357153/full</a>  <a href="https://vigyanvarta.in/adminpanel/upload_doc/VV_0624_65-C.pdf">https://vigyanvarta.in/adminpanel/upload_doc/VV_0624_65-C.pdf</a></p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is appropriate for scholarly communication</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Belinda Ndlovu
Department, University & Country	Zimbabwe