

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_119675
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing high-yielding variety Anand Komal for dual-season cultivation in Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L. Moench)
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.I found that the manuscript represents a huge importance for both scientific and farmers, he development of Anand Komal for dual-season cultivation significantly boosts agricultural productivity in Gujarat, providing farmers with a high-yielding crop option that can be grown in both summer and kharif seasons.</p> <p>2.No, I would prefer to add the country name and the climat type of the region,</p> <p>3. It has to be more precise, and there is no statistical analysis to support the results.</p> <p>4.Mainly no, the is no discussion part and a lot of tables to present</p> <p>5.Yes</p> <p>6.Not enough references and no articles related to the work are mentioned.</p> <p>7.Add more key words.</p> <p>8. The objective of the work is not clear also no hypothesis was made in the end of the introduction.</p> <p>9.What test was used for statical analysis? If its ANOVA one Factor, why no decisions or comparisons were made at results part.</p> <p>10.The experimental design is not clear, at which part, the moisture stress was applied and at what level, how also, a lot of work is needed to complete this part.</p> <p>11.No discussion</p> <p>12.In the tables, no mean, no legends</p> <p>13.Add a map of the region, GPS position for the regions.</p> <p>14.A lot of tables that could be presented as histogram</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Language should be improved	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The work is very interesting but need to be present in better way	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bouherama Amina
Department, University & Country	USTHB, Algeria