

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_99758
Title of the Manuscript:	Divergence analysis of Bitter gourd genotypes for yield and yield attributes
Type of the 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 Genetic divergence for yield and yield attributes were evaluated in 33 bitter gourd genotypes for 17 characters. The current study was proposed with the main objective of assessing the available genetic divergence for yield and yield attributes which can be further utilized in crop improvement programmes. Maximum inter cluster distance was observed between cluster III and cluster V, hence diverse parents for hybridization can be selected from these clusters. 2- Yes 3- Yes 4- No Results and discussion sections were not clearly appropriate. 5- Yes But need for serious revision. 6- No References in introduction need to be sufficient and modern.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hamdy M. Abdel-Rahman
Department, University & Country	National Research Centre, Egypt