

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_129034
Title of the Manuscript:	ENHANCING AGRICULTURE THROUGH WIRELESS SENSOR NETWORKS
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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It provides a solid methodology and offers findings that could lead to practical advancements in field of agro tech. The research is relevant with the potential to spark further studies and applications. Overall, it has clear significance for researchers and practitioners working in this area. However, a few areas require additional clarity to fully realize the manuscript's potential impact. The abstract fails to clearly outline the research problem, methodology, and significant findings. This is a crucial part of any manuscript, as it sets the first impression	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is relevant but could be made more specific to emphasize the manuscript's unique contributions.	
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 lacks certain critical points, such as a clearer statement of the problem, key results, and their implications. Consider the following improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a sentence that explicitly defines the research gap being addressed. • Highlight the methodology or unique approach in few sentences. • Summarize the key findings with specific data or observations. • Conclude with the broader impact or potential applications of the study. • 	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically accurate, and the methodology is robust. However: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure all calculations and inferences are thoroughly validated with supporting evidence. • There may be a need to include a sensitivity analysis or additional tests to confirm the reliability of the results. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient. But most of them are Outdated .	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language used in the manuscript is clear and professional,	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The abstract fails to clearly outline the research problem, methodology, and significant findings. This is a crucial part of any manuscript, as it sets the first impression. • A more detailed discussion of how the results relate to real-world applications or future research directions. • This paper is Overgeneralized conclusions not strongly supported by the data 	

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:	Mohd Salim Jan
Department, University & Country	National Institute of Electronics and Information Technology (NIELIT), India