

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123388</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Actuation Drones in Agriculture: Advancing Precision Pest Management through Biocontrol and Modern Techniques – A Review</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>
<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>I support the author(s) of the article in their assertion about the importance of applying the full range of modern technologies for their effective use in agriculture. Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) are among such technologies. When using new technologies, especially experimental ones, it is important to avoid potential harm and the development of new, previously non-existent problems in agriculture. UAVs and the work entrusted to them by the author(s) of the article are, on the contrary, intended to optimize pest control, where the amount of pesticides is reduced compared to other widely used technologies, such as full-area spraying. I believe that the reviewed article addresses important and timely issues aimed at optimizing and greening agriculture.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title of the article is optimal. I do not see the need for any changes.</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 abstract fully reveals the topic of the article and its content.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The structure of the article is generally satisfactory. In my opinion, the current situation could be improved by more clearly defining the thematic sections of the article. For example, after the Introduction, it would be appropriate to add a new section with a brief description of what will follow, under the tentative title "1. Drones in Agriculture," with the sections "Actuation Drones for Precision Releases of Natural Enemies" and "Actuation Drones for Precision Releases of Biopesticides" presented as 1.1 and 1.2, respectively. In this case, the section "Reducing Pest Populations with Drones: Sterile Insect Technique and Mating Disruption" becomes "2," and "Sterile Insect Technique (SIT)" and "Mating Disruption" become 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. Additionally, in Section 1, it would be appropriate to trace a brief retrospective of the use of drones in agriculture in general terms, since the authors position the article as "A Review."</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 manuscript of the article is executed at a sufficiently high scientific level. The main arguments are: the manuscript has a well-organized structure, where the research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions are clearly presented (with minor corrections as noted above); the chosen topic is important and relevant to agriculture, making the research a significant contribution to the development of the field; the conclusions are based on a thorough analysis of available information sources; modern and valid scientific methods were applied for data collection and processing; the manuscript contains a sufficient number of relevant references to previous studies and sources that support the information presented.</p>	
<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>The list of references is sufficient and fully reveals the factual basis of the research presented in the manuscript. It covers a wide range of studies related to the topic over a relevant time period. In my opinion, it would be useful to add DOI identifiers to those sources that contain them (provided the journal model supports this). This would help interested readers more easily find the relevant resources referenced by the author(s) of this article.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The level of English, in my opinion, is sufficient and does not require additional corrections. However, as a non-native English speaker, I cannot confirm this with absolute certainty.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Overall, I believe that the article submitted for review can be published in the Journal of Experimental Agriculture International with minor revisions and additions. The article would benefit from the integration of key figures that provide readers with a visual representation of the specific drones (their general structure—especially the parts responsible for detecting pests and targeted pesticide spraying).</p> <p>The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the algorithms for detecting and spraying pesticides is practically overlooked. This area is crucial for achieving the best results in the context of this topic. I recommend that the author(s) add 1–2 key paragraphs in the first section about the potential and importance of using AI for pest detection and targeted pesticide application with drones. Accordingly, the number of new sources in the reference list should increase as well.</p> <p>The Conclusions, in my opinion, are too brief and only reveal the work done in very general terms. The section of the Conclusions dedicated to future research prospects and the use of drones in agriculture needs to be revised. It should clearly outline the most important directions, opportunities, challenges, and proposed solutions.</p> <p>Throughout the manuscript, there are minor technical errors, including double and extra spaces, as well as their absence where they should be, for example: to growers[39].</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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Serhii Kyrlyuk</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Ukraine</b></p>