

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_117109
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF DIFFERENT HYBRIDS OF SPONGE GOURD (<i>Luffa cylindrica</i> L.) IN TERMS OF GROWTH, YIELD AND QUALITY, UNDER PRAYAGRAJ AGRO CLIMATIC CONDITION
Type of the Article	

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>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. Yes, it does as address the area of improvement in agricultural yield in other to curb food shortage. 2. Title is O.K 3. This fairly is comprehensive. Author should check punctuations vis a vis the sentences. Abstract reported the period of study as 2022-2023. 4. No, materials and methods section is not comprehensive enough. Study design, experimental site, methods of determination of each parameter should be in subsections. Study period was captured here as 2023 (LINE 1) but 2022-2023 in the Abstract, please reconcile this. 5. Yes, manuscript is scientifically correct but neds to address point 4 above. 6. The citation and referencing style are inconsistent. Author should comply with the journal's author guidelines on this. When <i>et al</i> is used, it must be in italics. Furthermore, the following citations are not in reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bal et al., 2004 • Bor, 2006 • Partap, 2012 • Klemm, 2001 • Mazali and Alves, 2005 • Hassan, 2006 • Anon., 2016 • Gopalan et al., 1999 • Takahashi, 1980 • Beyer et al., 2002 • Zalapa et al., 2006. 7. Punctuations and headings in the whole manuscript should be edited. This includes table headings as well. 8. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Author should try referring to tables as this is expressed. Some of the table results are not captured in methodology. Please refer to pint no 4 above. 9. CONCLUSION Make it more apt, avoid the use of values as well. 	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is, author should just re-check the grammatical few errors.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Ogundeko, Timothy Olugbenga
Department, University & Country	College of Medicine & Allied Health Sciences, Bingham University, Nigeria