

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_107471
Title of the Manuscript:	OVERVIEW OF HYDROPONICS TOWARDS HIGH QUALITY PRODUCTION OF VEGETABLE CROPS
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 1.7

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is very useful to the scientific community and as such it is recommended that this journal consider it for publication after all comments/observation is being corrected. 2. The title is suitable for the article. 3. The abstract is satisfactory. 4. The subsections and structure are not all that appropriating. The sections and subsections should b properly numbered/structured. Similarly, sections should be written in lower case except the first letter of the sentence. 5. Except where the attention of the author is being drawn to in red inks, the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. The references are highly insufficient. The author has not provided most of the source of his/her information and are such citations are not only insufficient but inappropriate, mostly in the introduction. 7. References numbers 1, 4 and 13 are not in the content of the manuscript. 8. As underlined by me, one and should be removed from reference number 10. The author should use comma instead. 9. The author uses both parentheses and square brackets in citation. It is advised the stick to one pattern, preferably parentheses. 10. As a scientific journal, it is also advised that the author make use of APA style of referencing and citation. 11. Table 2 is not appropriate. The author should arrange table 2 appropriately. 12. Sharma <i>et al</i>, 2018 not captured in the references. 13. In pag 6, the author talks about experiment. Which experiment? Who conducted the experiment? Because this is a review article. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	Satisfactory upon carrying out necessary corrections.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mbuotidem Usen Ntinya
Department, University & Country	University of Calabar, Nigeria