

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJHR_121275
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Evaluation of Growth and Yield Parameters of Different Varieties of Okra in Lamjung, Nepal
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript provides findings of different okra varieties (7) in terms of their growth and yield parameters in a district in Nepal. I like the aspect of the experiment carried out by the researcher but the author lacks the knowledge to frame the sentences correctly and moreover there are many grammar mistakes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable but I suggest to use this title Field Evaluation of Growth and Yield Parameters in Different Okra Varieties in Lamjung, Nepal	
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.	It would be good to improve the abstract again	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is robust provided that the author makes the corrections suggested by me in the manuscript attached.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but discussion part need to be improved.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shaik Moizur Rahman
Department, University & Country	Agricultural University,Hyderabad, India