

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_104904
Title of the Manuscript:	“Genetic Variability and Correlation Studies on Different Hybrid of Bitter Gourd (Momordica charantia L.) in Prayagraj Agroclimatic Condition”
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>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	It may serve the purpose after the corrections mentioned in the ms are carried out Suitable Not at all, it should give information about the total research, which is lacking. It should be improved Appropriate Its okay There is no mention of references in the results and discussion part, moreover all the references mentioned in the introduction are very old references, there is no updation	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is suitable	
Optional/General comments	The ms should be revised properly, including the suggestions made in the ms and also discussion part should include references. The abstract needs improvement	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	N. Anuradha
Department, University & Country	Acharya NG Ranga Agricultural University, India