

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_126900
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of the Environmental Parameters of Hydroponic Crop Grown under Polyhouse Conditions in Different Seasons
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	As for the objective of the work, it should be highlighted, as well as the working hypothesis. On the other hand, the innovation of the work and its specific contribution should be emphasized. the abstract should be improved by putting more hard data on the results obtained. it is recommended to update the bibliographic references it is recommended to make a broader discussion where the best obtained conditions are presented.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	the article is scientifically and technically sound as it uses the scientific method to evaluate the different variables of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	increase the updated bibliography	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of English should be improved	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Juan Hernandez Avila
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of the State of Hidalgo, Mexico