

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_123160
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Bottle Gourd [Lagenaria siceraria (Mol.) Standl.] Genotypes for Quality Traits.
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Dear Editor,</p> <p>My comments and suggestions on the manuscript (Manuscript Number:2024_JSRR_123160) you sent me for review are as follows. In my opinion, it would be appropriate for the manuscript to be published after the completion of the suggested minor revisions.</p> <p>The manuscript presents valuable data on bottle gourd genotypes and their quality traits. However, to improve its impact and relevance, the authors should consider addressing the deficiencies mentioned below. Enhancing the discussion with a deeper analysis of the results, updating the literature review, and emphasizing the practical implications of the study will significantly strengthen the manuscript.</p> <p>Abstract:</p> <p>The abstract provides a clear summary of the study's objective, methodology, and key findings. However, it could be improved by including a brief mention of the study's significance and potential applications of the findings.</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction effectively highlights the importance of bottle gourd, its cultivation, and the relevance of the traits studied. The section provides a good background but lacks recent references to support the discussion of the importance of quality traits such as TSS, ascorbic acid, and skin thickness. Including more updated literature would strengthen this section.</p> <p>Material and Methods:</p> <p>The methodology is generally well described, detailing the experimental design, the genotypes used, and the traits measured. However, there are a few areas where more detail would be beneficial:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i: The description of the statistical analysis could be expanded. In particular, the method for calculating heterosis and combining ability is mentioned, but the rationale for using these methods and how they relate to the objectives of the study is not clearly stated. <p>Results and Discussions:</p> <p>The results are presented in a structured manner, with appropriate use of tables to summarize the findings. However, the discussion could be made more informative by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i: Providing a more in-depth interpretation of the results in the framework of previous studies. Although some comparisons with previous research are made, the discussion would benefit from a more critical analysis of how these findings agree or disagree with the existing literature.ii: Expanding on the implications of the results, particularly with regard to the potential use of specific genotypes in breeding programs or commercial cultivation. <p>There were a few specific typographical errors and formatting inconsistencies that I noticed in the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ The word “combing” used in the text and in Table 5 needs to be corrected to “combining”.✓ Repetition and page number errors in references: <p>Three different studies by authors named Patel M, Singh R, Kumar P (2019) are listed, but the</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>page numbers of the first and third references are similar:</p> <p>“10. Patel M, Singh R, Kumar P. Variation in total soluble solids among different bottle gourd genotypes. Journal of Horticultural Science. 2019; 34(3):210 -218 . 11. Patel M, Singh R, Kumar P. Variation in ascorbic acid content among different bottle gourd genotypes. Journal of Horticultural Science. 2019; 34(3):310-318. 12. Patel M, Singh R, Kumar P. Variation in rind thickness among different bottle gourd genotypes. Journal of Horticultural Science. 2019; 34(3):210 -218. ”</p> <p>✓ Capitalization Errors:</p> <p>The initials of some words may be capitalized unnecessarily. For example, instead of “Heterosis of Ascorbic Acid content” it should be “Heterosis of ascorbic acid content”. “krutika et al; 2023” should be revised as “Krutika et al.,2023”.</p> <p>✓ Spelling Errors:</p> <p>There may be misspelled words such as “combining” instead of “combing”. Such errors should be corrected.</p> <p>✓ Table numbering and citations:</p> <p>Numbering of tables and citations in the text should be consistent. Each table must be cited before it is listed. Table 1 was not cited in the text.</p> <p>✓ Lack of Consistency in Citations:</p> <p>In the text, citations such as "(Yogendra et al; 2021)" are used, but the correct format should be "(Yogendra et al., 2021)" with a period after "et al." and a comma before the year. Similarly, "(Patel et al; 2019)" should be corrected to "(Patel et al., 2019)." Ensure uniformity in referencing style throughout the manuscript, especially for punctuation in in-text citations.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ercan Ekbi
Department, University & Country	Ordu University, Turkey