



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57103

Title: Sarv Sampurna Kisan Mitra - AI Based Crop Disease Detection and Management System

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
- Accept after minor revision.....
- Accept after major revision**
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			x	
Techn. Quality		x		
Clarity			x	
Significance				x

Reviewer's ID: JPR- 171

Detailed Reviewer's Report

This manuscript presents an integrated AI-based framework for crop disease diagnosis, recommendation, and risk prediction. The concept of unifying deep learning, knowledge graphs, and predictive analytics into a single platform is timely and potentially impactful for smart agriculture. However, the paper in its current form suffers from several substantial deficiencies that require major revision before publication consideration.

First, the manuscript reads predominantly as a system proposal or design document rather than a completed research study. The "Results and Discussion" section is vague and lacks quantitative validation accuracy claims of "96–99%" are presented without a proper confusion matrix, precision/recall metrics, or comparison with baseline models. No real-world farmer testing or field deployment data are provided. Second, the reference list is severely incomplete: entries [2], [3], [4], [5], [7], [10], and others lack journal names, DOIs, or publication venues, raising concerns about scholarly rigor. Third, multiple figures (Fig 1.1, Fig 3.1.1) are referenced but missing from the manuscript, disrupting readability. Fourth, the dataset description is insufficient—training with only ~120 images per class is small for deep learning, and no data augmentation or train/validation split methodology is detailed. Fifth, the writing contains grammatical errors and awkward phrasing (e.g., "fagriculturegoeswrong," "out sea fragmented solutions"). The authors must thoroughly revise language. Finally, the proposed "collaborative filtering" for treatment ranking lacks any algorithm specification or evaluation. For a major revision, the authors should: (1) provide actual experimental results with standard metrics; (2) complete all references; (3) include missing figures; (4) add a proper dataset description with augmentation details; and (5) clarify what has been implemented versus proposed. With these changes, the manuscript could become a valuable contribution.