

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_125585
Title of the Manuscript:	Growth and Yield of Vertically Trained Watermelon [Citrullus lanatus (Thunb.) Matsum. & Nakai] Under Different Levels of Spacing, Training and Pruning under Rain shelter
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This study investigates the pruning, cultivation and planting frequency of watermelon. Due to the global warming problem, cultivation in high and low temperatures is becoming difficult today. In addition, greenhouse installation costs are quite high. Rain shelter is less costly than greenhouse installation. Thanks to suspended cultivation, more products can be obtained from the area. In addition, applications are made more easily in the study. In this sense, the subject examined has been established in accordance with recent years and is beautiful in terms of subject.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Suitable	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Necessary edits have been made within the article.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The planting intervals selected in the research are suitable for watermelon cultivation. Watermelons can be grown by hanging cultivation. In addition, choosing a hybrid variety is suitable in terms of ensuring resistance to conditions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The study was written without using sufficient and up-to-date sources and editing is suggested. More sources are needed, especially in the discussion and introduction section, and the reasons for the differences or similarities should be stated. There are many studies on watermelon and pruning in the literature.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor revision have been made to the article.	
Optional/General comments	The most important problem in the study is the number of repetitions of the experiment. There should be at least 3 replications in the experiment setup phase. However, this study was organized with 2 replications. This situation increases the margin of error in the experiment. The number of replications should be controlled. In addition, the parameters to be examined in the material method phase are not specified. It is not specified how the examinations are made and how many replications are made on how many samples.	

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:	Pinar Adiguzel
Department, University & Country	Cukurova University, Turkey