

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_122259
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of physiological traits of bottle gourd (<i>Lagenaria siceraria</i> (Mol) Standl) genotypes
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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The main objective in bottle gourd breeding is to develop high-yielding and early varieties. Understanding its physiological traits is an important activity in selecting high-yielding lines to be used in research programs. This manuscript should be improved further in its overall aspects which would provide the readers a clear and easily understandable information.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
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.	The abstract is not comprehensive. It needs thorough proofreading and concluding remarks. It should provide more specific details about the primary outcomes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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 manuscript needs a thorough revision in all aspects. The introduction needs to be strengthened. The results need to be explicitly explained and discussed with relevant scientific backing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	References are outdated.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, many grammatical errors are present	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Meniari Taku
Department, University & Country	India