

Manuscript: “**Productividad D E Lechuga (Lactuca Sativ A L .) En Acuaponía E Hidroponía**”

Submitted: 09 January 2021

Accepted: 27 May 2021

Published: 30 June 2021

Corresponding Author: Bautista Olivas Ana Laura Dra.

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n21p283

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Edgar Omar Rueda Puente, Universidad de Sonora, Departamento de Agricultura y Ganadería, Carretera a Bahía de Kino km. 21. Hermosillo, Sonora, México

Reviewer 2: Dr. Federico Daniel Morla, National University of Rio Cuarto, Argentina

Reviewer 3: Valeria Santa, Universidad Nacional de Rio Cuarto, Argentina

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

General comment:

According to the review of manuscript Productividad de la lechuga (*Lactuca sativa* L.) en acuaponía e hidroponía

for European Scientific Journal, ESJ:

Accepted without changes___ minor changes_xxx__ major changes__ Not accepted
___Research paper _xx__ Short communication ___
Forum ___ Review _____

Dear personalities:

As far as I am concerned, the article is original to be presented in the Honorable European Scientific Journal, ESJ

The document was written in form concise and the contributions are excellent to enlarge the knowledge in this sense. However, is important consider some observations realized.

CONFIDENTIAL COMMENTS FOR THE EDITOR:

The manuscript is comprehensible, brief, clear, concise, original, and relevant to the field of this journal. The information of the data reported here are interesting and important; the authors revealed that Land use change for agriculture under poor farm management and inefficient water use, produces infertile soils. For green vegetable farming, there are some techniques for the achievement of high crop yields with the lowest economic and environmental costs. The study objectives were to estimate and compare lettuce yields (*Lactuca sativa* L.) in aquaponic (SA) and hydroponic (SH) production systems.

Methodology encompassed two stages: the establishing of a Nutrition Film Technique

(NFT) productive system and the monitoring of the crop growing in both systems. Data base integration and statistical analyses were performed using Windows Excel version 10. Average lettuce weight using t-test (significance level of 0.05) were 0.056 kg (\pm 0.005 kg) in SA, y 0.097 kg (\pm 0.007 kg) in SH. SH reached higher yields (1.847 kg/m²) than SA (1.080 kg/m²); likely due to the fact that SH had all needed nutrients since the beginning of the crop, by applying fertilizer. High temperature influenced fishes behavior in SA, observing lower food consumption and organic waste supply to the water, releasing low nutrient load that affected crop production and yield. More studies are recommended in order to deepen the outcomes, such as those including water flow and the comparison with conventional lettuce crop systems.

HOWEVER, THEY HAVE TO CONSIDER OBSERVATIONS

According to above the title with the goals are agree. Only they have to reorders some sentences before the goals.

The abstract, key words, Introduction, methods and discussion in this study look important. However is important consider some observations into the document.

Introduction:

The Introduction, in this study looks important. However is important consider some observations.

Consider rules to write the references into the text

Methodology:

In the section of MATERIALS AND METHODS: In general, the authors must remember that in this section the information with clarity will have to be provided, with detail, because some colleague could be interested in verifying the experiments of this information. Nevertheless, details about methods commonly used and some materials will be able to be omitted.

Results:

Please consider the observations into the document.

Discussion:

The discussion in this study looks important. However is important consider some observations.

SECTION II (Cont.)

Bibliography/References:

Consider rules to write the references

Others:

Decision:

Accepted with moderate revision

SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)

Originality: 2
Contribution To The Field: 2
Technical Quality: 2
Clarity Of Presentation : 3
Depth Of Research: 2

SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)

Accept As Is:

Requires Minor Corrections: XX

Requires Moderate Revision: XX

Requires Major Revision:

Submit To Another Publication Such As:

Reject On Grounds Of (Please Be Specific):

SECTION V: Additional Comments

Please add any additional comments including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any:

Dear personalities:

According to the review of manuscript Productividad de la lechuga (*Latuca sativa* L.) en acuaponía e hidropoNIA for European Scientific Journal, ESJ, I am sending the observations:

Accepted without changes__ minor changes_xxx__ major changes__ Not accepted
__Research paper _xx__ Short communication ____ Forum ____ Review

As far as I am concerned, the article is original to be presented in the Honorable for European Scientific Journal, ESJ:

The document was written in form concise and the contributions are excellent to enlarge the knowledge in this sense. However, is important consider some observations realized.

Sincerely yours,

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

In the section of MATERIALS AND METHODS: In general, the authors must remember that in this section the information with clarity will have to be provided, with detail, because some colleague could be interested in verifying the experiments of this information. Nevertheless, details about methods commonly used and some materials will be able to be omitted.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:

*

As part of the Open Review, you can choose to reveal your name to the author of the paper as well as to authorize ESJ to post your name in the review history of the paper. You can also choose to make the review report available on the ESJ's website. However, ESJ encourages its reviewers to support the Open Review concept.

- Yes
- No

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper:

*

- Yes
- No

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. Some comments and corrections are in the manuscript.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

(Please insert your comments)

Some comments and corrections are in the manuscript.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. Some methodology is missing. Comments and corrections are in the manuscript.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes. Some comments and corrections are in the manuscript.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

*

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

*

Each in-text citation has to be included in the list of references and vice versa.

(Please insert your comments)

Yes

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3

- 4
- 5

Please rate the *BODY* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *CONCLUSION* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Please rate the *REFERENCES* of this paper.

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Overall Recommendation!!!

*

- Accepted, no revision needed
- Accepted, minor revision needed
- Return for major revision and resubmission
- Reject

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Tengan a bien tomar las sugerencias realizadas en el cuerpo del manuscrito.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2021

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Valeria Santa	Email:
University/Country: Universidad Nacional Rio Cuarto - Argentina	
Date Manuscript Received: 25-03-2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 26-03-2021
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 13833-Texto del artículo-40835-1-4-20210209	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result
	[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>El título del trabajo es claro y adecuado</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	5
El resumen expresa correctamente los objetivos, métodos de desarrollo del trabajo y sus resultados	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
Cuando los autores de lo trabajos son varios se debe tener en cuenta que "et al" se escribe con cursiva: <i>et al.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
<i>La metodología del trabajo y los equipos y materiales utilizados se explican correctamente</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	5
El trabajo en general no contiene errores, es de fácil lectura y comprensión	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
La conclusión del trabajo tiene relación con la investigación desarrollada y los resultados obtenidos	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
Hay citas que no coinciden Ej: Noruega 2018 en texto y Noruega 2019 en citas bibliográficas; Ramirez 2009 en texto y Ramirez y varios autores mas 2009 en citas bibliográficas. Faltan algunas citas bibliográficas. Por ejemplo: Hernández y Hernández (2005) Hay citas bibliográficas que no están en el texto. Por ejemplo: Figueroa, J. (2007).	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	X
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):