

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_102061
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing plant growth and crop productivity through hydroponics technique for sustainable agriculture: A Review
Type of the Article	Review Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The article is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. The summary is comprehensive and fulfills the purpose.</p> <p>4. The subsections and titles of the article I consider should be restated to show the scientific advances in knowledge and the current state of the art, in such a way that it is presented with continuity in the development of the review article.</p> <p>5. The reviews in number and quality are insufficient, a greater review of quality scientific articles on advances in hydroponics is possible.</p> <p>6. References are insufficient.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>1. The article presents an adequate language for its communication to the scientific community, making the proposed improvements such as the scientific names of the crops and others, as well as making a better writing of the introductions of the consulted articles.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>In the document the observations are made for the improvement in the article. It is expected that a review article of this nature contains a minimum of 50 scientific articles consulted and 80% produced in the last 5 years.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Armando Torrente Trujillo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad Surcolombiana, Colombia</b>