

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

Qingtian Zeng

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The paper advocates for a cautious and logical approach to promoting AI in agriculture, considering its potential impact on labor displacement and the effectiveness of alternative, non-AI-based pest management strategies. There are no obvious grammatical errors, and the sentences are structured in a coherent manner. The language used is clear and concise.

However, the following problems exist:

- (1) The article starts with a discussion of various agricultural challenges but quickly narrows down to PBW in cotton. Gossypol is then introduced, which is not directly linked to the AI solutions presented. Please relate the introduction of AI applications to the specific solutions presented. Please clearly explain transitions between topics.
- (2) In the section "Other related studies & Competing technologies," the article uses the terms "nature-based solutions" and "eco-friendly" without providing clear definitions or explanations.
- (3) There is clear repetition in the article, with certain parts of the text repeated verbatim. This repetition detracts from the coherence and professionalism of the writing.
- (4) The text uses emotive language such as "reckless" to describe farmers' use of pesticides. It also uses subjective terms such as "impressive" when talking about GMO solutions in the US.
- (5) Some sentences could be rephrased for improved clarity. For example, consider:
"The results reported in this study are further confirmed..." instead of "The results reported here...";
"Several other studies have also shown..." instead of "Several other studies have also reported..."