

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_110939
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluated the effect of hydrogel on physio- chemical and microorganism properties of potting media in roof top cultivation of ridge gourd
Type of the Article	

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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Because it will improve knowledge, expertise, and attitudes within the agricultural community, it is significant for the scientific community. As the study is put into practice, the soil's productivity level will increase. It will inspire additional researchers to do out research in this field and make significant contributions to global improvement.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) It is innovative and appropriate, but it requires thorough research to close the knowledge gap and boost productivity by maintaining fertile soil. This is scientific study, requiring a great deal of fieldwork and laboratory effort. The findings have also led to improved solutions to mitigate the qualities of the soil in the practical activities.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? The abstract mentions the study's title, but it doesn't say where the research is being conducted. The technique and objectives are absent. Additionally, the article's conclusions are presented. Nevertheless, the abstract omits a conclusion and a recommendation.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? There are no specific goals or hypotheses stated in the brief introduction. Additionally, there is a dearth of literature addressing research gaps and titles. Methodology of the research The study used a fully randomized block design with ten treatments and three replications, taking into account thirty EF bags with two plants each. Getting growth media samples ready EF bags containing 5.5 kg of media were filled with a mixture of sand, vermicompost, and vermiculite-perlite (3:2.5:0.5) ratio, while the dose ratios for cocopeat and hydrogel were (3.5, 2.5, 1.5, 0.5, 1, 2.5, 1.75, 3 correspondingly). An example from the growth medium A digital pH meter (Criso, pH meter GLP 21, Bracelona, Spain) calibrated with pH 4 and pH 7 buffer at room temperature was used to measure the pH. For analysis, samples from the growing media at a depth of 0–15 cm were taken 75 and 150 days after the crop was transplanted into each growing EF bag. After being kept in plastic bags, the samples were brought to the lab and homogenized, sieved with a 2 mm mesh size, and then stored at 4 °C.</p> <p>Using the Karmer HSD test, all analyses were conducted in a fully random design (CRD) using JMP software version 12 (SAS, 2010). Three replicates and ten treatments were used in the experiment.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

Review Form 1.7

	<p>The study topic and aims are well-represented in the tables in the discussion and outcome section. Nevertheless, there is a lack of thorough discussion between the results and those of other researchers.</p> <p>Additionally, Table 4 merely displays the table; no discussion or analysis of the table's results is done.</p> <p>Last but not least, the conclusion lacked key findings, made no recommendations, and failed to highlight the gaps that require additional research in the future.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>Because the document adheres to the scientific principles of the research endeavor, it is correct from a scientific standpoint.</p> <p>It has a separate introduction, goal, methods, analysis and discussion, conclusion, and references.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>The references are up to date and useful for carrying out the investigation. Even if the citations are sufficient, they are not relevant to the study's introduction and discussion sections.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> <p>There is a communicative use of language. However, readers of this article may find it difficult to understand some of the phrases used in the texts. It must employ language that each and every article reader can grasp.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
2. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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