The authors of the manuscript conducted a deep analysis of publications related to sustainable food production and the integration of advanced tools to improve environmental performance and operational efficiency into the field of modern agricultural production.

Overall, the manuscript is written at a fairly good scientific level; however, I have a number of questions and comments.

1. The title of the manuscript generally reflects the content, but the abstract does not fully correspond to the text that follows. In the abstract, the authors talk exclusively about CEA, which may give the reader an incorrect idea of the article itself. In fact, the authors analyzed 70 literary sources, starting from 2001, when CEA was not yet discussed (due to the development of agriculture and related industries at that time). And, accordingly, the overwhelming majority of the articles do not relate to CEA; rather, they are related to the modernization of agriculture in general. Thus, in Table 1, only one article (reference No. 39) out of 10 presented relates directly to the controlled environments.

Accordingly, I believe that the authors need to rewrite the abstract considering the above, without placing such an emphasis on CEA specifically. Based on the materials analyzed by the authors, we can only speak about the current high prospects (and needs) for the introduction of RS and ML in artificial climate facilities.

2. The authors demonstrated a good knowledge of the research topic. However, I believe that in line 91 the reference to the review article by Dsouza et al. [3] is not entirely correct; a reference to the works of the "classics" of the CEA topic - D. Despommier, Al-Kodmani, Kozai - would be more appropriate.

3. Figure 1: The drawing should be given a more detailed title that reflects its essence. All figures must be accompanied by more detailed captions: in figure 2, indicate the topic of the articles, in figure 3, the topic and years (2001-2025), the same for figures 4 and 5.

4. The years in table 1 need to be corrected: for a number of references they are incorrect.

5. In line 311, the abbreviation UAV should be explained.

6. Line 350 requires italics for the Latin name of the insect pest.

7. In lines 390-391, indicate the city and country for each of the mentioned scientific institutions.

8. Figure 5 should be placed after it is mentioned in the text.

9. The English language needs some correction in places.