

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_89943
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Sponge gourd (<i>Luffa cylindrica</i> L.) hybrids for growth, yield and quality traits
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The grammar is week, kindly revise and improve the English. 2. The abstract lacks the basic points; aims, conclusion and recommendations. 3. Reduce the length of introduction and make it more concise with logic and flow of information. 4. The introduction section is over repeated. Revise it accordingly. Para 1 and 2 have similar information, 1 and 3 have the same information repeated, and so on. 5. Para 8 and 9 have no reference. 6. The fonts size is style is not uniform. 7. In "M&M" section, no information about the parameters and analysis. 8. The tables should be made in 3-line table format. 9. The results section is not written properly, while the tables are not referenced in the text correctly. As I didn't find table 3.2 and so on, while the tables are numbered as 1, 2 10. The ANOVA table only listed the df, while Mean squares and error mean square values are missing. (Re arrange the table and add the MS and EMS values). 11. The figure for cluster analysis is not included. 12. A discussion needs to written and included in the articles. 13. Write a conclusive conclusion. (the present conclusion is too long). Provide recommendation based on your research. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract: Line 10-13: the sentence is loo long with confusing meaning. Restructure.</p> <p>Introduction: Line39-50" there is repetition of information. Rewrite the unified information in single para. The fonts size and style of the tables is not standard and uniform. Revise all the tables. The arrangement and quality of the figure 1 and 2 are not good. (shades). Insert good quality clear images with consistent font size and style. Remove figure 3 and 4</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The writing is very weak with scattered information in the introduction section. This article is not publishable in its present form. However, after the recommended revisions I can be published.,</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:	Ahmad Ali
Department, University & Country	Huazhong Agricultural University, Pakistan