

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_121514</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Laboratory Evaluation of Soil Moisture Sensors for Precision Irrigation in Agriculture</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This article provides important information regarding the laboratory evaluation of soil moisture sensors for precision irrigation in agriculture.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is adequate to the content of the article.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract of the article is well written, adequately explains the research setting and issues.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The introduction provides an adequate description of the problem addressed and demonstrates the significance of the research problem. However, it is limited in its scientific scope. The methodology used is appropriate to the purpose of the research but could be restructured to enhance its scientific rigour. The results are interesting and important to researchers in relevant fields of agriculture. However, for the publication of this study, it would be beneficial to supplement it with other determinations to support its importance and opportunity.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript presents some issues of scientific accuracy that require further attention. For instance, the research methodology is not sufficiently detailed, which hinders an assessment of the study's rigour and reproducibility. Furthermore, the literature cited is limited and does not reflect the most recent research in the field, which reduces the manuscript's relevance and theoretical context.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The number of references is limited and some corrections need to be made. I recommend the inclusion of a larger number of more recent studies on the subject and their insertion in bibliographic references;	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>I recommend a carefully check of the full manuscript to correct any grammatical or syntax error.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Please, take into account the following recommendations to improve this manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The general presentation of the manuscript should be reviewed, the extra spaces between words or the lack of spaces between titles, subtitles, tables, figures and text according to the requirements of the journal;</li> <li>- I recommend a revision of the manuscript according to the requirements of the journal (English, technical editing, bibliography, etc.);</li> <li>- I recommend a critical approach to the literature to enable analysis and interpretation of the information, development of an objective viewpoint and the setting of clear objectives;</li> <li>- The theoretical documentation of the study is fragile, it does not include those sources (materials, reports, publications etc.) which offers a direct treatment of the subject to research (a comprehensive review published on the nutritional profile of the green coffee beans ;</li> <li>- I recommend that conclusions be formulated highlighting the importance of the results obtained;</li> <li>- I recommend including more recent bibliographic references.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the above mentioned, I recommend this paper for publication after performing the suggested corrections.</p>	

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Daniela Stoin</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Life Sciences "King Michael I" from Timisoara, Romania</b></p>