

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_105306
Title of the Manuscript:	An examination of the effects of different transplanting dates, planting geometry and training techniques on the yield traits, productivity and quality of cucumber (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) under naturally ventilated polyhouse
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.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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, it is.</p> <p>2. I suggest "Assessment of the effects of different transplanting dates, planting geometry and training techniques on the yield traits, productivity and quality of cucumber (<i>Cucumis sativus</i> L.) under naturally ventilated polyhouse"</p> <p>3. Yes, it is.</p> <p>4. Yes, they are.</p> <p>5. Yes.</p> <p>6. I think that the author has not sufficiently discussed the results.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, it is.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>There are small suggestions and doubts, which are noted throughout the text.</p> <p>In the table result: did the author test averages? Which test used Tuckey, Duncan, other? Where are the statistical differences founds represented?</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Maria da Graça de Souza Lima
Department, University & Country	Brazil