

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_121189
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in bottle gourd [<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i> (molina) standl.] genotypes
Type of the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>If of the 25 genotypes, including a control, a good result has been achieved, contrasted in 14 of them, it can be considered a good performance, making it interesting to continue the research. Since the analysis of variance for the design has achieved significant differences between the genotypes.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The summary is scarce, it is recommended to give more length to the content. It may contain the answer to questions such as: why was the study done? What was done and how? what are the results? What do these findings mean and what impact do they have? Correct the indentation of the text in the left margin, at the beginning of the text. The conclusions are correct, but they are very few. With the number of results obtained, the explanation in the conclusion must be expanded.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure is correct. The titles are correct. Introduction, materials and methods, results, and conclusions. Abbreviations should be explained or placed on a table.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>It can be considered a well-formed and structured manuscript, although errors must be corrected. The references and some images are recommended that further clarify the study carried out.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>It is advisable that the references are not older than 8-10 years. Except for one or two if their use is extremely important. It is suggested to make a bibliographic review of the studies published in the last 10 years and update the references in the text. Some more reference could be advised. Some more reference could be added, up to 40. All references must be named in the article.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Typographical errors to be corrected. Spaces after periods, hyphens, separations... - It would be interesting to give some more data in the conclusion, more information about the result obtained. Explain a little more the good results obtained. - As a tip, you can add a section, Analysis of the limitations of the study. 	

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:	Noe Anes García
Department, University & Country	University Oviedo, Spain