

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-52298

Date: 16-06-2025

Title: Macromorphological study of some species in family Cucurbitaceae

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision ☒

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Techn. Quality			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Clarity				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Significance			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Reviewer Name: Dr Ankur Jyoti Dutta

Date: 16-06-2025

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)

The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.

- The abstract needs to be written in a proper research paper manner and should include at least 5 keywords that are relevant to the subject.
- Major restructuring of the paper is required in terms of journal guidelines is required as it current stage it exceeds the maximum number pages and words.
- Major grammatical errors were discovered.
- The paper doesn't seems to be research article/paper as it is written in a very elaborate manner. Only the relevant information related to the research needs to be highlighted.
- The referencing of the paper needs to be done as per the journals guidelines.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

1. The abstract of the paper should highlight the strength and reason of doing the study along with its significance in the scientific community.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

2. The figures included should have sources clearly mentioned along with the significance.
3. The paper needs to be concise down as it is way too elaborative. Some information can be put up in a matrix or tabular format where only their significance is highlighted rather than all the textual description.
4. The discussion/analysis part of the paper also seems to be way more elaborative. It only needs to state the findings and significance of the test that were conducted on different plant species and how these tests have further justified the author's research or idea.
5. Also there seems to be lacking the conclusion part which needs to highlight why the study conducted is relevant and what it has contributed and the future prospective of this research.