

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_131164
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of Ultrasonic and Infrared Sensors for Detection of the Target for Development of Orchard Sprayer
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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/>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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.	The chapter title is acceptable but doesn't seem to hold significant value for the broader community. While it addresses ultrasonic sensors, the topic feels somewhat niche and less impactful in the current context. A more contemporary or community-focused title could have made the chapter more appealing and relevant.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title is somewhat limited in its appeal and relevance. A more contemporary title that reflects the broader applications of ultrasonic sensors would increase its significance.	
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 and introduction are well-crafted, providing readers with just enough background information to grasp the topic. They are concise yet engaging, successfully maintaining the reader's interest without overwhelming them with unnecessary details. This balance is commendable and sets a strong foundation for the rest of the paper.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, the manuscript appears scientifically valid, with a well-structured methodology and appropriate statistical measures. However, the formulas need proper mathematical notation, and all abbreviations should be clearly defined upon first use.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are outdated and insufficient, which undermines the paper's credibility. A lack of recent and diverse sources suggests that the research may not be grounded in the latest developments or a robust theoretical framework. Including more up-to-date and comprehensive references would strengthen the foundation of the paper.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kaushalya Vaibhav Thopate
Department, University & Country	Vishwakarma University, India