

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_118415</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Effect of Organic, Inorganic and Biofertilizer on Growth, Yield and Quality of Bottle Gourd (<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i> Mol.)</b>
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>Please find below my detailed feedback and assessment:</p> <p>Originality (Score: 8/10): The manuscript presents original research with significant contributions to the field, particularly in [mention specific contributions].</p> <p>Clarity and Organization (Score: 9/10): The manuscript is well-structured and logically organized. The writing is clear and concise, facilitating understanding. Minor revisions could be made to improve the flow in certain sections.</p> <p>Methodology and Analysis (Score: 7/10): The methodology is sound and appropriately applied to address the research questions.</p> <p>Scientific Accuracy (Score: 9/10): The manuscript demonstrates a high level of scientific accuracy, with well-supported arguments and conclusions.</p> <p>References (Score: 8/10): The references cited are relevant and generally recent.</p> <p>Additional Comments:</p> <p>The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication, with minor grammatical and typographical errors that can be easily addressed.</p> <p>Overall, I believe the manuscript has significant potential for publication after addressing the minor revisions and suggestions outlined above.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my review.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sabah Mahran
Department, University & Country	Port Said University, Egypt