



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	American Journal of Experimental Agriculture
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/AJEA/2326
Title of the Manuscript:	Precision Farming for small agriculture farm: Indian scenario.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	[1] There does not seem to be any novelty in the study. Several definitions can be easily retrieved from previous papers about precision ag. [2] There is no clear implementation of scenarios 1 and 2. Where are the results of these applications? The goal of the study was to support the use of precision ag contrary to traditional management. But in order to do so, the authors need to present the results of the other scenarios, so as to make the comparisons. [3] There is no description of dataset. Where do the numbers that were utilized come from? For example, the # of reference stations. [4] The methodology is insufficient and is not based on any statistical model. [5] How are the case studies connected to the implementation presented? There does not seem to be any practical relevance, other than the informative part. [6] Not adequate and recent literature cited. [7] Repetitive definitions of precision agriculture that recycle the same concepts (i.e., line 44, then 51, then 54, then 72, then 79, then 89, 101, 116). [8] Lines 39 and 45 repeat the exact same sentence.	Agree to some extent as the paper is basically ia a review paper. This has been written based on the case study and review done worldwide. Accordingly modifications are incorporated based on the reviewer's comments. The case studies are presented because it has the relevance with the application of PF in the country i.e. India. Modifications incorporated.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	[1] Sections 7.0 and 8.0 shall be moved above 6.0 (Scenarios description). [2] 9.2 title is with capital letters - inconsistent formatting. [3] Section 4 is underlined, whereas other sections are not.	Changes are made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		