SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJBCRR_36296**
Title of the Manuscript:	**INFLUENCE OF HARVESTING STAGE ON SEED QUALITY ASPECTS OF PUMPKIN (Curcubita pepo L.).**
Type of the 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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI 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	**Overall, the study was well designed and well executed but the manuscript lacks a good discussion and major corrections in the manuscript must be done before it is suitable for publication.** **I suggest that the authors correct the langue with the help of a native English speaker because some paragraphs are unstructured and difficult to understand.** **In addition, some points need to be addressed by the authors as indicated below.** According to the guide for authors, the lines of the text should be enumerated in order to facilitate the location of any mistake. **Abstract:** • According to general guideline for authors, in the abstract different sub-sections should be used (aim, methodology, results and conclusion). **Introduction** • Throughout the text the citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3]. • The abbreviation DAA should be clarified when quoted for the first time. • The main aim of the work should be clearly stated. **Material and methods** • Page 4; last paragraph: 4 samples of … CHANGE TO Four samples of … • Make clear the sentence: "The results were expressed as a percentage of normal seedlings and <u>the average percentage calculated to the nearest whole number</u>." • The variables of the equation were not identified. **Results** • The results were not properly described. The Tables or Figures comes after the results have been described.	

	• The caption of Table 1 is incomplete. • Caption of Figure 3 and 4: Seedling height of … • Caption of Table 2: Electrical conductivity of what? This analysis was not described in Material and Methods. • The Table 3 should be Table 1 because is describing the weather conditions of the local where the experiment was conducted. **Discussion** • Improve the discussion. • A strong and concise conclusion is recommended at the end of discussion. **References** • The references must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. • The references should follow the style according to general guideline for Authors. • In the list, there are some references not cited in the text and others are in the text but are not in the list. This must be checked.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	**Although the subject is interesting, the manuscript requires major revisions before been accepted for publication as pointed out above.**	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Inês Cechin***
Department, University & Country	***Department of Biological Sciences, Sao Paulo State University, Brazil***