

Review of: "Artificial Intelligence & Nature-Based Solutions in Agriculture: A BT Cotton Pest Management Case Study in India"

Eray Onler¹

1 Namik Kemal University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

- The study lacks a robust control of variables, particularly environmental factors that might independently affect pest activity and crop yield, such as the unusually high rainfall mentioned.
- There is a potential bias in data collection, as it relies heavily on self-reporting by farmers or observations that might not be standardized across all participants.
- The impact of the study is somewhat diminished by its limited scope (specific to certain regions and crop types) and the short duration of data collection (one or two seasons).
- The discussion might benefit from a deeper analysis of the scalability of AI technologies in agriculture, addressing how these findings can be applied more broadly across different farming contexts or regions.
- Some arguments seem speculative or are not sufficiently supported by the data provided, particularly claims about long-term environmental benefits or labor impacts without substantial evidence from the study.

Recommendations:

- Expanding the literature review to include a broader spectrum of sources, including more recent studies that discuss
 the use of AI in agricultural settings beyond pest management.
- Integrating a more critical analysis of past approaches to pest management in cotton farming, perhaps highlighting
 what has and has not worked, could provide a clearer backdrop against which the current study's contributions can be
 measured.
- Discussing theoretical or conceptual frameworks around technology adoption in agriculture could enhance the depth and relevance of the study, helping to situate it within ongoing academic conversations.
- A more detailed discussion on the socioeconomic impacts of AI adoption in agriculture could be beneficial, including
 how it might affect smallholder versus large-scale farmers differently.
- Addressing potential risks and ethical considerations associated with AI in agriculture could provide a more balanced view and suggest areas for future research or policy intervention.
- Discussing the potential for resistance development in pests due to AI-driven pest management strategies could also add depth, linking back to the literature on resistance management in pest populations.

General Conclusion:



The article has a promising foundation but falls short in fully developing its themes through both literature engagement and discussion. Enhancing these sections could significantly improve the academic rigor and impact of the work, offering clearer insights and contributions to the field of AI in agriculture.