

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_121615</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Role of Artificial Intelligence in Vegetable Production: A Review</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review</b>

#### **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	Reviewer's comment	<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.	This is a literature review of AI applications to agricultural production. It uses a lot of undefined acronyms that should be defined at first introduction in the manuscript. Also, it has no PRISMA diagram and accompanying methods section.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, please see previous regarding a PRISMA diagram and accompanying methods section describing how the articles were derived with which to make an informed judgement of the comprehensiveness of the review. Also, and similarly, there needs to be a Limitations subsection the Conclusions/Discussion.	
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.	Please see previous.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Please see previous.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is quite good and no need for copy-editing (please see previous).	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Also, there are a few declaratory / factual sentences begging reference / citation, for example: Par 2, sens 1,2,and 3; and Par 3, sens 1 &2. Entire manuscript should be scrubbed for any other occurrences	

**Review Form 3**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ralph J Johnson</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UT-MDACC, USA</b>