

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105471
Title of the Manuscript:	Development and evaluation of IoT based nutrient management system for greenhouse tomato (SolanumLycopersicum L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>)

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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ An important study, but what is its discourse different from Hassan et al. (2022)? ➤ Granted this is an experiment conducted in India, but fertigation control systems for improving crop yields have been studied extensively in Israel since the 1930s and this is just one of them. ➤ Examine the views of prior authors, critique and formulate own stance. ➤ What is the statement of the problem (in question form) the study is meant to address? ➤ Who will benefit from this research? ➤ What recommendations do you offer for further research in this field? ➤ What does this research add to the already existing body of knowledge? ➤ A good scientific study will have a conceptual framework displaying the various study variables – those that can be controlled by the researcher and those that cannot be controlled and/or manipulated. ➤ This is a snapshot experimental study. Would the outcomes change if the experiment were to be repeated a few more times before the results can be generalized? <p>Suggest: "Improving yield of tomatoes grown in greenhouses in India"</p> <p>The abstract should be one paragraph (long, if necessary) without sub-headings. It should provide a summary of the research including statement of the problem, objective(s), research question(s), procedure, methodology/research tool(s), results and key words.</p> <p>This is an experimental study that has focused more on methodology and analysis followed by results and discussion. There are no recommendations offered for further research on the same.</p> <p>This is an important study that requires greater thought in presentation and analysis – however, it ranks nowhere near studies done in Israel on the same subject matter.</p> <p>References are sufficient in scope and scale, but it would have been helpful to pick on a few references from scientists in Israel who have been studying fertigation systems since the 1930s with varying and interesting findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Mind sentence structure, spelling and word use to conform with Grammarly and the International Publishing Standards, 6th Edition.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Would you have rather considered a research study on growing tomatoes as hydroponics under greenhouse conditions?</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Elijah W Chindia
Department, University & Country	University of Nairobi, Kenya