

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105093
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of different hybrids of sponge gourd (<i>Luffa cylindrica</i>) in Prayagraj Agro climatic conditions.
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:

(<https://www.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable with slight modification</p> <p>The abstract of the article is Comprehensive</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate</p> <p>The references are not in order. Six References given at the end are missing in the text. In addition, some more references need to be added. The details of comments are given below.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>1) In Materials and Methods, the last para is irrelevant. Details of spacing, plot size/ number of vines per treatment, number of irrigation, method of planting, design of experiment, observation methodology, statistical analysis, etc. need to be mentioned.</p> <p>2) Results are very brief, need to be elaborated.</p> <p>3) The discussion is completely lacking. Needs to be included.</p> <p>4) Six references need to be cited in the text suitably.</p> <p>5) Cost-benefit ratio needs to be included in the Table 3.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	R. A. Balikai
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences, India