

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_120654</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>EVALUATION OF OKRA (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L. Moench) GENOTYPES FOR GROWTH AND YIELD PARAMETERS</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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:

<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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION 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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it evaluates different okra genotypes for growth and yield parameters, potentially enhancing global agricultural productivity and sustainability. Its practical focus could inform future breeding programs and agricultural strategies aimed at improving food security and resilience against future challenges.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "EVALUATION OF OKRA ( <i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L. Moench) GENOTYPES FOR GROWTH AND YIELD PARAMETERS" is generally suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. It clearly indicates the crop (okra), the type of research (evaluation of genotypes), and the main parameters studied (growth and yield). However, if we want to make it more comprehensive, we could consider including the quality aspect as well, since the study also evaluated fiber content. A slightly modified title could be: "EVALUATION OF OKRA ( <i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L. Moench) GENOTYPES FOR GROWTH, YIELD, AND QUALITY PARAMETERS" This modification would more fully represent all aspects of the study.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Based on my review, the abstract of the article is reasonably comprehensive as it covers the key points of the study. It includes the purpose of the investigation (evaluating okra genotypes), the location and timeframe of the study, the experimental design used (RBD with 3 replications), and key findings regarding superior genotypes for various traits.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	However, I would suggest a few minor additions to make the abstract more complete :Add a brief statement on the statistical analysis used (e.g. "Analysis of variance revealed significant differences among genotypes for all traits studied"); Add a concluding statement on the potential use of these findings for okra improvement programs.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript showcases scientific rigor through its robust experimental design (Randomized Block Design with three replications), extensive evaluation of 31 okra genotypes including a control, comprehensive analysis of agronomic traits, rigorous statistical validation of genotype differences, and insightful interpretations linking trait variations to genetic and physiological factors in okra.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. -	Regarding references, the manuscript includes a mix of relatively recent (2017-2021) and some older (2008-2013) sources. While this provides a good historical context	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nouichi Asma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Constantine 1 University, Algeria</b>