

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121615
Title of the Manuscript:	Role of Artificial Intelligence in Vegetable Production: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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 <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 is related with the Review Manuscript for Journal of Scientific Research and	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. Title: Role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Vegetable Production : A Review	
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.	No. Need major corrections, Please refer to the recommendations that stated in the manuscript and Abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Satisfactory, Need some improvement.	
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.	There are many confusion in the flow of ideas and discussion with some paragraph is vogue. Need alignment with the objectives and outcomes of study from other scholar findings. To many questions as mentioned with no elaboration and discussions. No contributions and recommendations of study as stated by the researcher.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	There are some errors on the academic writing technique the diagram and results.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Satisfactory, Need some improvement.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Hj. Mustafa Bin Dakian
Department, University & Country	UNIRAZAK, Malaysia