



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_52394
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis of Physio-Chemical Properties and Plant Growth Characteristics using Different Growing Media
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>I found a lot of critical points in the present manuscript:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the lack of references (only seven);</li> <li>2. the experimental plan is not clear (ex. the growing period is reported in the results but not in the materials and methods; the measurement timing is not reported and it is only present in the figures as "DAS");</li> <li>3. the caption of the figures is lacking and the statistical analyses is not reported;</li> <li>4. the style of the graphs is not homogeneous, they should be the same ("T1, T2, T3..." are both horizontal, vertical and angled;</li> <li>5. it's better to report Figure and not Fig. in the caption;</li> <li>6. Plate 1 and 2 are figures and it is better to report the treatment and not the word "better" or "poor";</li> <li>7. The last part is reported as "cost analysis" but I can't find any analysis or cost. When you say "higher reduction in cost (2.3%)..." how is it calculated? Is it the cost of the production of substrate?;</li> <li>8. General conclusions are missing.</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The language and the general format of the manuscript should be revised and improved. The references in the text in the form of "...reported by" should not be between brackets.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The idea to compare and test different growing media in order to find the best combination of substrates for soilless culture is very interesting however, the manuscript is not well written and it is poorly structured.	

**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)



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Giulia Franzoni</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>University of Milan, Italy</i></b>