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

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript of the scientific community. Why do you like for dislikely this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an atternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically sentences of this part. Are the references will call the science of this part. Are the references will call the science of this part. Are the references will call the science of this part. Are the references will call the science of this part. Are the references will call the science of this part. Are the references will call the science of this part. Are the references will call the science of this part. Are the references will be scientifically	6		
manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like for dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. gentlyes, contributing to crop improvement programs. The identification of high can be required for this part. gentlyes good the same state of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the title of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 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. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. 2 Minor ReVISION comments Is the larguage English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Doblosal/General comments	Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	
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. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 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. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Optional/General comments	manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be	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	
the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 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. 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. Yes Add some references of some recent studies. Yes Add some references of some recent studies. Yes Optional/General comments		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. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. Import REVISION comments Add some references of some recent studies. Yes	the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please		
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. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 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. Add some references of some recent studies. Yes Optional/General comments	Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A	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	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? Optional/General comments	suggestions of additional references, please mention them in	Add some references of some recent studies.	
Scholarly communications? Optional/General comments	Minor REVISION comments	Yes	
	Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Please expand the conclusion section, as it is currently brief and lacks detail.	Optional/General comments		
		Please expand the conclusion section, as it is currently brief and lacks detail.	

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sushila Arya
Department, University & Country	Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, India

Created by: DR Checked by: PM Approved by: MBM Version: 3 (07-07-2024)