

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_129042
Title of the Manuscript:	Drones vs. Tradition: Economic Efficiency and Challenges in Modern Agriculture through Machine Learning
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 <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.	This manuscript highlights the potential of drone technology to revolutionize Indian agriculture by increasing economic efficiency and reducing costs in paddy cultivation. It identifies the challenges to adoption, emphasizing the need for policy support and training for farmers. The results show very significant improvements in farmer income and productivity as a consequence of focused interventions. The study provides important insights toward precision agriculture, encouraging further exploration of sustainable farming practices.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title should be changed as it should be matched with research objectives and the research itself. The proposed title is "Drones vs. Tradition: Comparing the Economic Efficiency and Adoption Issues in Modern Indian Paddy Cultivation"	
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. However, the abstract contains 351 words, whereas the guidelines require it to be reduced to 300 words. The first paragraph of the abstract, which serves as the introduction, is overly detailed and could be shortened. There should be 4-8 keywords.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. It provides a well-researched comparison of drone-assisted and traditional farming methods, supported by data on efficiency, cost reduction, and income improvements in paddy cultivation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are recent but not sufficient. However, given that these are emerging technologies in a field with limited research, the availability of references is constrained. However, it is recommended to include additional references to strengthen the manuscript. References should also be prepared in accordance with the new reference style introduced on October 19, 2024, as per the journal's author guidelines.	
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 effectively conveys complex ideas with clarity and precision, adhering to the standards expected in academic writing. However, the corrections to be made are highlighted in the manuscript in yellow.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the manuscript presents valuable understandings and contributes significantly to the field. Suggested corrections, deletions, and additions are highlighted in yellow for clarity. It is recommended to discuss the results in comparison with previously published findings on related topics, if available, to provide a broader context and strengthen the study's relevance.	

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