

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>

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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The importance of the study is not clearly depicted 2. The authors focused on the certain environmental parameters rather than production of Basil crop 3. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is better focused on Basil production in response environmental and management packages 	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The abstract doesn't reflect any result of the study. It seem like reading out a text book 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction part could be more specific, precise and shortened. 	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are many grammatical errors, incorrect way of citation 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need to add more recent references 2. Also the references are not prepared in the correct format 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better the article considered as short communication 	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
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:	Khumukcham Chandrakumar Singh
Department, University & Country	VCSGUUHF, India