

Review 1

1. Paper id: *

27

2. Author(s): *

Crisan Dragos, Adriana Coroiu

3. Title: *

Implementation of machine learning algorithms in precision agriculture using soil data

4. General evaluation: *

- ☐ Very good - contains original work
- ☒ Good - not original work, but methodologically sound, detailed
- ☐ Acceptable - correct work, but could have been improved
- ☐ Poor - unacceptable

5. Overall recommendation: *

- ☐ Accept as it is
- ☒ Accept with minor modifications
- ☐ Weak accept (major modifications are needed)
- ☐ Reject

6.

For each criterion, please use the scale to answer the question:

"To what extent does the article meet this criterion?" *

	1. Fails by a large amount	2. Fails by a small amount	3. Neutral	4. Succeeds by a small amount	5. Succeeds by a large amount
The subject addressed in this article is worthy of investigation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
The paper contains original work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The title of the paper reflects sufficiently and clearly the topic.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
The abstract contains a sufficient summary of the work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The introduction is relevant to the topic and has clear objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research method is solid and proven.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The results are clearly presented with sufficient analysis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conclusions are supported by the data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The references are adequate and appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The English is satisfactory.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

7. Is this paper a good candidate (appropriate) for publishing in Studia Informatica?

(Please do not mark with YES papers that are highly likely to be rejected immediately by the reviewing panel of Studia Informatica – because of their quality. You are strongly suggested to propose the required modifications to make it a good candidate for publication)

*

☒ Yes

☐ No

8. If YES – please score the quality of this paper from the perspective of publication in Studia Informatica:

<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="2"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>	<input type="text" value="4"/>	<input type="text" value="5"/>
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

9.

Remarks concerning the contents and recommendations for optional or compulsory modifications. Please give a frank account of the strengths and weaknesses of the article: *

I recommend reading the article again, there are some typos such as: in the introduction "developments possibilities" -> "development possibilities"; "it's influence" -> "its influence"; "characterised" -> "characterized".

In the Computational Experiments chapter where the methods used are described, I think there should be more references.

I think reference 5 can be exchanged for a book or a scientific paper.

I would like to see a constant in the bibliography, use only one style in writing the references.

On the last page, the text written in red must be removed.