

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129041
Title of the Manuscript:	Economic Analysis of Unmanned Aerial Vehicle using Machine Learning: Drones in Agriculture Pertaining to Farmer Producer Organisations
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	This manuscript highlights the economic benefits of drone technology in agriculture, addressing a critical research gap. It demonstrates significant cost savings and increased profitability, offering valuable insights for sustainable farming. The findings contribute to the broader understanding of how emerging technologies can enhance efficiency in agriculture. The focus on Farmer Producer Organisations ensures practical relevance, with findings applicable to similar agricultural settings globally.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It should be changed to meet objectives and conclusions. Proposed title is "Economic Analysis of Drone Technology in Agriculture: Perceptions from Farmer Producer Organisations in Tamil Nadu"	
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. It is comprehensive. There should be 4-8 keywords.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically accurate as it effectively analyzes the economic impact of drone technology in agriculture. By presenting data-driven insights, such as cost savings, increased profitability, and reduced resource wastage, the study offers a valid and well-supported assessment. Its focus on Farmer Producer Organisations ensures practical applicability, and the methodology aligns with established economic analysis practices. These attributes make it a reliable contribution to the scientific community.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes. References are sufficient and recent. But they have not been cited in the text. Corrections have also made in yellow.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications. It employs clear, concise, and formal language appropriate for academic contexts, effectively conveying complex ideas and data. The structured presentation and logical flow enhance its readability and alignment with scholarly standards. However, the corrections have been made in the text in yellow for further refinement.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is well-structured and provides valuable information on the economic benefits of drone technology in agriculture. However, Table 1 is unclear and incomplete, and Table 3 requires format alignment. Comparing the results with previously published findings is recommended to enhance context in the discussion. Additions, deletions, and changes highlighted in yellow further refine the manuscript for improved clarity and impact.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A.A. Yasarathna Amarasinghe
Department, University & Country	Sabaragamuwa University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka