

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_110506
Title of the Manuscript:	Performance of different F1 hybrids of Cucumber ( <i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) on growth, yield and quality
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript important for scientific community. This research has presented the comparative performance of various types of hybrid cucumber and their nutrition level which is very significant for consumers understanding.</p> <p>2. I think the title is not exactly suitable. The title should be "comparative performance analysis of different F1 hybrids of cucumber (<i>cucumis sativus</i> L.) on growth, yield and quality.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. A short findings of research should include in abstract.</p> <p>4. subsections and structure of the manuscript are not appropriate. Objectives of the study is not mentioned in the research, there is absent of literature review and literature gap. Recommendations of researcher is also absent here. But all these steps are important for a good research.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. I think the references are sufficient and recent enough.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The researcher should give more attention on quality of language and there are some grammatical error.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Well, the research paper is good enough and scientifically significant. But researcher should provide attention on its language quality and at the part of methodology the method of Fisher and Yats 1963 mentioned by researcher is not clear. The method should clarify by researcher.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Laily Akter</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Jatiya Kabi Kazi Nazrul Islam University, Bangladesh</b>