

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_99554</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>VARIABILITY AND CORRELATION STUDIES IN RIDGE GOURD (Luffa acutangula L. Ruxb.)</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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Compulsory REVISION comments</b>  <b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  <b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)  <b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b>  <b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  <b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b>  <b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<b>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community considering the general idea about the experiment and the entire writ-up looks good but some statements need to be concise for ease of understanding.</b>  <b>2. The title may be slightly modified (see my input in the main manuscript).</b> <b>3. The abstract should be systematic and concise, indicating the objectives, materials and methods, results and conclusion</b> <b>4. The subsections are not elaborate. For instance, under materials and methods, study location, materials methods (how planting was done and data collected and analysed)</b> <b>5. Scientifically, it is correct but can be improved with scientific statements</b> <b>6. Looks ok</b>	
<b>Minor REVISION comments</b> <b>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	I think there is room for improvement (see comments in main manuscript). Some statements have to be scientifically communicated e.g. significant differences of means ("not at par")	
<b>Optional/General comments</b>		

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mutari Abubakari</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>CSIR-SARI, Ghana</b>