

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_101451
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF CUCUMBER (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) GENOTYPES AND VARIETIES UNDER 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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This manuscript is important for scientific community, particularly for plant breeding. 2. The title may be revised into "The growth characteristics of cucumber (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) genotypes and varieties grown under prayagraj agro-climatic conditions. 3. The abstract should contain the purpose of the research 4. The basic structure of this manuscript is appropriate, but data interpretation in the results and discussion session are not comprehensive. 5. The manuscript can still be regarded as correct scientifically, but a lot of revision should be made to fulfil the journal standard quality. 6. The references are not recent and were not written in accordance with the guideline of this journal. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	I would suggest the author to check the English using spelling/grammar checker application.	
<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)
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:	I Gede Ketut Adiputra
Department, University & Country	University of Hindu Indonesia, Indonesia