

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120539
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of different pre-sowing treatments on seed germination and seedling characteristics of Bitter Gourd (<i>Momordica charantia</i> L.), Bottle Gourd (<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i>) and Ridge Gourd (<i>Luffa acutangula</i>)
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://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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript tried to provide insight on the need for treatment of certain crops before sowing. This is essential and should help farmer with improved yield. However, the manuscript was poorly written (very poor), and therefore fails to catch readers attention.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No Influence of different pre-sowing treatments on seed germination and seedling characteristics: a case study of bitter gourd (<i>Momordica charantia</i> L.), bottle gourd (<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i>) and ridge gourd (<i>Luffa acutangula</i>)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	No I suggest the authors rewrite the abstract	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No	
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.	The manuscript is not scientifically and technically sound. There are lot of information which convey no meaning. The grammar is very poor with lots of wrong tenses. The discussion could not be linked to the experimental results. It has methodology that is not properly organized. The authors did not consult adequate articles for reference and information before presenting this work.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Not sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Very poor	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Ojiabo Kenechukwu Theresa
Department, University & Country	Federal Polytechnic Nekede, Nigeria