

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJECC_102908</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Genetic Variability, Heritability and Genetic Advance for Yield and Yield Contributing Characters in Bitter Gourd (<i>Momordica charantia</i> L.) Genotypes</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> 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>1.- The manuscript is important, since the study resource is a source of curative remedies for certain diseases, such as type II diabetes.</p> <p>2.- The title is consistent with what was studied</p> <p>3.- The summary is understandable and adequate to be a technical study.</p> <p>4.- Idem 3</p> <p>5.- To a certain extent yes, it is interesting scientifically</p> <p>6.- The bibliographical references are sufficient, but if they could include more current ones it would be good.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is adequate and understandable, but it can be reviewed by a native of the language.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Follow journal guidelines</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>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Emelio Barjau Gonzalez</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mexico</b>