

## 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> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**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. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community, however the authors clearly indicate the novelty of this study</p> <p>2. Yes the title is suitable</p> <p>3. No the abstract is a bit vague so the authors must: announce this work with a brief context make clear the purpose and method(s) used put full forms of the abbreviations GCV and PCV should be for their first use in the abstract</p> <p>4. No, for this we propose that the work be divided as follows: Introduction-material-methods-result and discussion. We propose that the authors list separately the material that was used in the experiment "Material" and then the method used "Method" The authors should give the formulas in the method sub-section, these formulas are::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burton and De Vane</li> <li>• Johnson et al</li> </ul> <p>Which formulas allowed them to evaluate respectively the coefficients of genotypic and phenotypic variation and the heritability and the expected genetic advance</p> <p>5. The manuscript is scientifically correct, nevertheless the results must be well interpreted in substance in order to propose properties that can help the scientific community</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient, but many of them are not recent, and we suggest that the authors update the references with more recent ones. The references should follow the format recommended by the journal, for example 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p> <p>Please standardize by abbreviating journal names or writing in full</p> <p>7. With regard to the introduction, the approach of the subject were discussed, but the problematic, the general objective and the specific objectives have not been defined in this work. It is recommended to the authors to clearly define the problematic that motivated them to elaborate this research work, they must also show the objective and the specific objectives for a better understanding of this work.</p> <p>8. The conclusion synthesizes the results obtained in response to the specific objectives in order to draw the reader's attention to whether or not the intended objective has been achieved. In this work, the authors did not respect all these expectations, therefore I propose that they take back the conclusion by inserting the synthesis of the results that responds to the expected specific objectives and to the main objective.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	yes, the quality of the language and English of the article is appropriate for scholarly communication	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	The authors should revise the abstract by adding what has been recommended. The introduction should clearly indicate the novelty of this work, specifying the objective and the specific objectives, and elaborating on the results and discussion in order to provide a scientific contribution to this study that could benefit the scientific community. The conclusion should be corrected according to the recommendations provided. All references must follow the format proposed by the review and provide recent references.	

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

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Tigori Mougo André</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Université Jean Lorougnon Guédé, Côte d'Ivoire</b>