

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_118271
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Divergence Studies in Cucumber under Mid hill conditions of Solan district of Himachal Pradesh
Type of the Article	Scientific

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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript shows important and relevant results for scientific community who're managing genetic improvement and global food security. It shows that there is a great diversity in cucumbers genotypes. 2. The title is consistent with the content of the manuscript. 3. The abstract shows a look to the subject also you can see a look a resume of the results, thus is suitable. 4. The manuscript does not shows an evident conclusion section, thus the structure is not appropriate. 5. Results found in the study may be relevant but the discussion section does not cite any reference to contrast the results thus may be is not suitable as scientific document. 6. References are not enough and results and discussion section does not compare with another authors frequently. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	English quality is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Carolina Hernández Hernández
Department, University & Country	Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales Agrícolas y Pecuarias, México