

Review of: "Adoption of Machine Learning Methods for Crop Yield Prediction-based Smart Agriculture and Sustainable Growth of Crop Yield Production – Case Study in Jordan"

Aliyu Abdu¹

¹ Electrical Engineering, Kano State University of Technology, Wudil, Nigeria

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract: Too lengthy and descriptive. The abstract is supposed to be a concise summary of the work with a focus on identified problem(s), proposed methodological solution to that problem, and result with a drawn conclusion.

Introduction: Too lengthy as well. Consider adjusting it to only highlight the genesis that led to the adoption of ML in crop yield prediction, common practices and their drawbacks, and then round up with the proposed solution approach (with emphasis on your contribution). Advisably, everything should be within four paragraphs.

Literature review: Contains repetition of information already highlighted in the introduction, and the whole structure is not well arranged. The focus should be on previous and current related works, methods used, and their contributions and drawbacks if any. Consider synthesizing and restructuring.

Methodology: Again, the methodology section should be about the proposed approach only. Elements of the introduction and literature review are yet again being repeated here.

This statement, "Due to the complexity of machine learning models for the agricultural-based, creating the machine learning models is

quite tedious," is full of ambiguity. Either break down and explain what you meant by the complexities and how tedious the MLs are (with citations) or please consider removing the statement.