Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_101551**
Title of the Manuscript:	**INFLUENCE OF 3G CUTTINGS IN BOTTLE GOURD (Lagenaria siceraria) FOR GROWTH, YIELD AND FRUIT QUALITY**
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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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)**	**1. Yes the manuscript is important for scientific community** **2. The title of the article is suitable.** **3. Yes the abstract of the article is comprehensive.** **4. Yes the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.** **5. I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. There are aspects that still need to be fixed, such as the fact that the tables are not cited in the text of the manuscript.** **The scientific correctness of the manuscript is established, but the style is not at all modern. Apart from the lack of minimal evidence of the development of the experimental activity (location maps on the territory of India, zonal location maps of the experimental plots, photographs of the experimental field, the scheme of the distribution of the experimental plots in the field for each variant from which the replicas can also be seen, photographs comparisons of the evolution of the crop variants for various stages of evolution, photos of the harvest for the visual comparison of the results), the tables should also be completed with some graphic representations of the results (see, for example, Fig. 2 added in the manuscript by the reviewer).** **6. There are references that are not cited in the text of the manuscript. They must be cited, otherwise they will be removed from the reference list.**	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Yes, the language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.** A control is added only for the introduction of pauses between words and numbers.	
Optional/General comments	Taking into account, first of all, the lack of any evidence of experimental facts and some editing errors noticed on the reviewed manuscript, I opted for a major revision, after which a new review is recommended.	

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:	**Cardei Petru**
Department, University & Country	**The National Institute of Research Development for Machines and Installations Designed for Agriculture and Food Industry, Romania**