

Review of: "Sustainable Agriculture: Aquaponics-Integrated Greenhouse Cultivation of Cantaloupe with Drip Irrigation System"

Nurul Nadiah Mohd Firdaus Hum¹

¹ Universiti Teknologi Mara

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall, the work conducted is applaudable.

However, in explaining the methods of implementation, particularly on the selection of Point 1 and Point 2, it was not clear as both points were not similar. What the favorable conditions in the selection were was not highlighted, and how the differences affect the results was not addressed. For example, Point 1 has an area of 500m² while Point 2 has an area of 850 m². Does both points have the same amount of plants? What is the mechanism in the fruit selection, as both are not the same in the greenhouse construction and also in the area coverage?

Sections 2.3 and 2.4 also do not elaborate on both points as in the planting and growth criteria. In section 2.4, Productivity Targets, the method used is not clear, on the number of harvested fruits being collected as productivity targets. It would be good if the author explained what this sentence meant:

"Number of harvested fruits: Only one fruit per tree is left, and the total number of fruits in the entire garden is counted to calculate the loss rate."

Is there any formula used? How does the author differentiate between Point 1 yield and Point 2 yield? Clarification of this sentence will enhance the understanding of the reviewer on the work conducted.

It would also be beneficial for the writer if Figure 2 were explained in English, as the diagram is in Vietnamese.

Section 2.5 mentions statistical processing; however, the type of stats used was not elaborated.

In Section 3, in the results and discussion, Point 1 and Point 2 results obtained were not shown; results were too general. It will be a loss if the two points were not highlighted, since the buildup condition and the area were different. Highlighting the difference will give the paper more meaning.

Discussion on section 3.2, Table 4, was not clear and does not tally with the following discussion. For example, Table 4 mentioned disease of white chalk, missed root collar, and left ass rot, while in the discussion in the text paragraph, diseases like leaf fungus, fruit rot, powdery mildew, and root rot were mentioned. Standardization of terms used in describing the diseases will definitely enhance the understanding of the writing.

Detail elaboration was given to the powdery mildew, while the other diseases were not elaborated. Missed root collar and left ass rot do have significant readings comparatively with the powdery mildew in the rainy season; hence, the discussion on these diseases will be an advantage to the writer.

Results for the statistical analysis were not found in the article.

Overall, the article has the essence of the work and can further be improved.888888888888888885