Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Plant & Soil Science**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJPSS_104830**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Performance of Ridge gourd genotype 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.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)*
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 contains relevant scientific information. However, most of the statements did not have any literature reference 2. The title is suitable 3. The abstract is not comprehensive enough. The authors failed to provide any information on the type of analysis that was carried out and the range of genotypic performance 4. The structure of the article is appropriate 5. Yes. But it needs serious revision. The authors need to clearly and categorically state the problem statement and the justification for the work 6. The references are not sufficient. The authors made a lot of statements in the introduction section that did not have any literature reference. They should provide more references especially in the introduction.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. **Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The English needs revision	
Optional/General comments	**Abstract** The authors failed to present results in the abstract. They did not indicate whether there were significant differences among the genotypes and the range of performance for the different traits. They only jumped to conclusions by indicating which genotype was the best in terms of maturity, yield parameters, etc **Introduction** The depth of literature review is weak. The authors quoted only one reference in the whole of the introduction eventhough they provided a lot of information. **Results and discussion** The authors did not put the tables in the text. They also failed to make any reference to the results in any of the tables. They should make reference to the tables in the text. **References** Very few references were listed. For a study of this nature, the authors need to conduct intensive literature review	

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:	**Joseph Adjebeng-Danquah**
Department, University & Country	**Savanna Agricultural Research Institute, Ghana**