

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120738
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of pumpkin cultivars against cucumber mosaic virus disease under field condition
Type of the Article	Journal

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://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It good paper in order to generate information and planting materials for breeders	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Recommendation regards to major finding must be added	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Detail effort is needed in case of material and methods and in discussion part also, to make full packaged scientific paper.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =	Some references should be added, especially regards to the current work.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Abstract to conclusion need detail revision and discussion	
Optional/General comments	In general, abstract, materials and methods, discussion and conclusion parts are too poor. So detail discussion by comparing previously research work done should be made. Your discussion related to your finding is too shallow. Please try to make it broad, clear, breaif and scientific discussion.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hika Bersisa Bayeta
Department, University & Country	Oromia Agricultural Research Institute, Ethiopia