

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_86977
Title of the Manuscript:	SOILLESS CULTIVATION TECHNIQUE, HYDROPONICS-A REVIEW
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.journalcjast.com/index.php/CJAST/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although it is a review article, several claims were made on the superiority of soilless agriculture. These claims are not clearly grounded. The word traditional agriculture should be avoided by a suitable term such as industrial agriculture etc. 2. A wholesale superiority of soilless agriculture is absurd due to the heavy reliance on freshwater which cannot be met in all regions of the world. System circuits in soil ecology which lead to natural soil reconstruction (the soil fauna such as earthworms) 3. Therefore, literature should be added on the input / product ratio that means input of exergy (technical energy) into the soilless production versus yield in nutrition energy (kilocalories) to provide a sketchy energy balance per unit of yield in terms of edible KJ on input in Kilojoules (or kilocalories,) soil services provided by earthworms etc. are to be excluded from the energy balance) 4. This input / product ratio is imperative to turn tales into hard facts 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Uwe C. Plachetka
Department, University & Country	University of Vienna, Austria