



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_44544
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic Diversity and Importance of Loofah 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:

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

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	This short report is presenting the evaluation of the genetic diversity of loofah accessions (<i>Luffa cylindrica</i> L.) by multivariate analyses techniques to the study of genetic divergence. The English is poor, numerous grammar mistakes within the text. The methods section is very brief and only a rough outline is given without details. No statistical analysis/comparison at all is presented in the manuscript.	All suggestions were adhered to.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Abstract: - in text "ABSTRATC" 2. In the abstract mentioned the accessions: BUCHA06 and BUCHA22, that it is not informative to any readers. Remove unnecessary formatting information: 3. MATERIAL AND METHODS / EXPERIMENTAL DETAILS / METHODOLOGY (ARIAL, BOLD, 11 FONT, LEFT ALIGNED, CAPS)	1 and 3 - Suggestions were adhered to. 2 - The accesses Bucha 06 and Bucha 22 were mentioned because depending on the objective of the breeding program the divergence of these could be interesting to generate variability.
Optional/General comments	Unfortunately, this is a poorly prepared manuscript. Results and methods used are correct and good.	All suggestions were adhered to.

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	