

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Scientific Research and Reports</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JSRR_115857</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Vertical Farming: Revolutionizing Sustainable Agriculture in the 21st Century</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<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>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>The paper has some problems that need to be solved for its publication:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is imperative to clearly state objective(s) that guide the review.</li> <li>2. The references must be updated; the newest ones in the paper are from 2020. Since many papers have been published on vertical farming issues and advantages, it is essential to include more recent references.</li> <li>3. The methodology must explain to the reader the entire process used to search and select the papers for the review, including search terms and search engine.</li> <li>4. The results are adequate for the period reviewed, but they need to be presented in a more engaging manner for the readers, as numbering topics is not a good way to present results.</li> <li>5. The conclusions need to be improved and should be closely related to the stated objectives.</li> <li>6. Some internet links cited in the bibliography are unavailable. These should be checked and replaced with accessible sources.</li> <li>7. In a superficial search of papers, I found several review papers dealing with the same topic but exploring different points of view. I recommend that the authors read and analyze these papers to avoid repetition and improve the quality of the presented review.</li> <li>8. I recommend that the authors read the following papers to improve the methodology of the paper:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. A Guide for Systematic Reviews: PRISMA. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mpsur.2009.07.005">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mpsur.2009.07.005</a></li> </ol>             Updating guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA 2020 statement. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.02.003">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.02.003</a> </li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</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>Oscar Perdomo</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad de Boyacá, Colombia</b>