

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are 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 suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. The topic is important for scientific community, but Poorly written and it should be more focused mentioning the need of the present review study. Overall the manuscript is poorly written with lots of fragmented and unclear sentences. Some were mentioned in the manuscript itself.</p> <p>2. OVERVIEW OF HYDROPONICS TOWARDS HIGH QUALITY VEGETABLE CROPS PRODUCTION</p> <p>3. It seems very scattered and overall objective of the study is not very clear.</p> <p>4. No</p> <p>5. No</p> <p>7. Author must discuss many recent references which were available on the same.</p> <p>Title: OVERVIEW OF HYDROPONICS TOWARDS HIGH QUALITY PRODUCTION OF VEGETABLE CROPS Suggested title: OVERVIEW OF HYDROPONICS TOWARDS HIGH QUALITY VEGETABLE CROPS PRODUCTION</p> <p>Abstract: It needs some more elaboration mentioning the salient finding of the research. Introduction: Poorly written and it should be more focused mentioning the need of the present work. Discussion: Need more clarity regarding purpose of the study. Poorly written, needs significant improvement. Author must discuss many recent references which were available on the same. The sentences and tables are incomplete; some comments were mentioned in the manuscript itself. General comments: Overall the manuscript is poorly written with lots of fragmented and unclear sentences. Some were mentioned in the manuscript itself. Final Recommendation: Keeping all the above mentioned points into consideration, I am of opinion that the manuscript needs MAJOR REVISION before publication.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is written too casually. Lot of spelling, punctuation and grammatical errors are observed throughout the manuscript. Besides, there were many sentences with very poor construction throughout the manuscript. Some of them are highlighted in the manuscript itself. Overall the manuscript is poorly written with lots of fragmented and unclear sentences. Some were mentioned in the manuscript itself.</p> <p>Final Recommendation: Keeping all the above mentioned points into consideration, I am of opinion that the manuscript needs MAJOR REVISION before publication.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tania Seth
Department, University & Country	ICAR-Central Institute for Women in Agriculture, India