

Review Form 1.7

Journal name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript number:	Ms_IJECC_99319
Manuscript title:	AEROPONICS: a polytropic research tool in the new era of agriculture
Item Type	Review article

General guideline for the peer review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that NO manuscript should be rejected solely on the basis of "lack of novelty", as long as the manuscript is scientifically sound and technically sound. For the complete guide to the peer review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	reviewer comment	Author comment (if you agree with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors are required to write their comments here)
<p>Mandatory REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important to the scientific community? (Please write a few sentences in this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article appropriate? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article complete?</p> <p>4. Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have any suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Other than the 6 points mentioned above, reviewers can provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is incorrect: The words are not found in the UNESCO THESAURI which is used for referencing in an academic context. The development of this section reveals its lack of serious academic references that support the proposal. As it stands it could be a midlevel job. If there is no objective, the results cannot be assessed.</p> <p>2. The title is relevant to the viable agricultural system</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article. - This section must have a research objective – a methodology – a strong conceptual framework – conclusions. What is presented can be part of the introduction.</p> <p>4. The structure of the review article requires taking into account the following: "Document resulting from a completed investigation where the results of published or unpublished research on a field of science or technology are analysed, systematized and integrated, in order to account for progress and development trends. It is characterized by presenting a careful bibliographical review of at least 50 references.</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically incorrect.</p> <p>6. The references It does not reach an academic level of publication, there are sources such as WIKI that do not contribute to the seriousness of the study. 0 academic articles.</p>	
<p>Minor REVIEW Feedback</p> <p>1. Is the quality of the language/English of the article adequate for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jeverson Santiago Quishpe Gaibor
Department, University & Country	Salesian Polytechnic University, Ecuador