

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_125730
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance studies of ridge gourd (Luffa acutangula (L.) Roxb.) Genotypes for growth and yield parameters
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the genetic variability among ridge gourd genotypes, contributing to crop improvement programs. The identification of high-yielding genotypes like Hireharukuni local (G-35) is crucial for breeding efforts aimed at enhancing productivity and growth traits. I appreciate the well-structured approach to evaluating multiple growth parameters and their correlation with yield, which adds depth to the findings. However, further exploration of environmental factors influencing genotype performance would strengthen the study's applicability across diverse growing conditions.	Ok, I will see through it
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No deletions seem necessary, but refining the focus on key results and their implications would improve the abstract.	Ok, I will see through it
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically sound, employing a well-structured experimental design with 38 genotypes and thorough analysis of growth and yield traits. The statistical analysis supports the identification of high-performing genotypes like Hireharukuni local (G-35), making the findings reliable. The results align with existing literature, confirming the study's technical robustness and relevance for crop improvement.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Add some references of some recent studies.	Ok, I will do it
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please expand the conclusion section, as it is currently brief and lacks detail.	Ok, I have done it in revised manuscript

[Review Form 3](#)

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