

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_130246
Title of the Manuscript:	Optimizing Sponge Gourd Cultivation: Effects of CHAs on Morphological Traits and Flower Development
Type of the Article	Original research article

#### **PART 1: 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. 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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

**Review Form 3**

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>Overview</b>                  The paper's insights on the growth of Sponge Gourd (Luffa Cylindrica) cultivation employing CHA approaches focused on morphological features and flower development to produce more output. The research employed gibberellic acid (GA3) and sulphonyl urea to monitor the vine.</p> <p><b>Comments</b>                  Lacking                  Positive                  Needs to change</p> <p><b>Theoretical Motivation of the Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author's finding regarding the specific area targeted for the farmer's crop production using past studies of literacy. Here it was tried to solve a problem or for overproduction which is impressive</li> <li><b>But, only specified the area thus might not be everywhere the techniques applicable.</b></li> <li>It could have been better if there was some other location that would connect to the relevant information</li> </ul> <p><b>Lack of Transparency</b></p> <p>##In the beginning tried to overview the study. <b>The authors forgot to add specific details to shorten the method.</b> Authors can improve by mentioning about CHA application and frequency of future directions also.</p> <p>##In the Introduction, the Authors included past studies overview for a better picture of the field. <b>But, unfortunately, many things do not perfectly introduce the paper such as:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Word sense is informal it should be formal and the Citation should be used at the correct point of a sentence or para <b>Their findings showed a 23% increase in vine length with GA3 application at 200 ppm.-(Citation ?)</b></li> <li>Similarly, Recent advances in understanding the molecular mechanisms underlying sex expression in cucurbits have provided new insights into the mode of action of various CHAs.-(Citation ?)</li> <li><b>The introduction does not directly state the author's problem but it shows relevant</b></li> </ul> <p>##The Method stepped better for observation and a nice presentation for the study purpose. It should be considered that the words used in the sentences should be perfect to sense, Chemicals used in the study the name should be correctable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Table 1 The data, from whether it was the author's work or others should be clarified.</b></li> <li><b>Photos are proof that missing in every step of the observation.</b></li> </ul> <p>##The result has been sectionized presentation looks better. The table should be attached with the caption and relevant para.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>( P.12, p.13, p.14 ) page format is not standard.</b></li> <li><b>Table 3 there is no mention of the year.</b></li> </ul> <p>##The authors discussed previous studies and literature reviews.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>There are weather conditions that aren't mentioned in the specific location.</b></li> <li><b>Has citation but not compared with author's study outcome</b></li> <li>Missing: requires improvement, Interpret Data, Acknowledging limitations, and logical conclusion</li> </ul> <p>## At last authors identified summarized the study and simply.</p> <p>## Future Working Scope has been determined but This section can be attached to the Conclusion part.</p> <p><b>Minor Points</b></p>	<p>Thanks for the comments                  Noted and revised as per the review comments</p>

**Review Form 3**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Too many grammatical objections in the whole paper</b></li> <li>• <b>Toos many short forms therefore Abbreviation section should be added to the paper</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The manuscript addresses the important and potential topic in agricultural improvement.</p> <p>I recommend a major revision to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify the methodology</li> <li>• Discussion Part for improvement</li> <li>• Formatting, Grammar, and Citation Style</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	