

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_117348
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Analysis of Land, Water, and Energy Requirements for Hydroponic and Conventional Cultivation of Horticultural Crops
Type of the Article	Review 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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript offers an interesting comparison between two distinct production methods regarding resource use efficiency. This comparison holds relevance in light of current planetary conditions and the escalating concerns for the future of natural resources.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title is adequate for the manuscript content and objectives.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and provides the necessary information.</p> <p>4. Yes.</p> <p>5. Yes, although it needs improvement.</p> <p>6. Yes, although only one is from 2022, and the rest are from previous years</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, although it needs some corrections.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I strongly recommend the authors to read the following papers to enhance their revision:</p> <p>1. How to Write Backwards https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277302837_How_To_Write_Backwards#:~:text=According%20to%20Magnusson%20(1996)%20%2C,for%20those%20conclusions.%20...&text=Justine%20K%20arst-....sources%20and%20writing%20effective%20proposals.</p> <p>The manuscript file contains numerous corrections and comments.</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oscar Perdomo
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Boyacá, Colombia