

Review Form 3

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

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

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)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is important because it contributes to improve knowledge about okra diversity and potentialities. It gives some results of the performances of okra genotypes which can be used for selection or breeding purposes. Also, with the comparison to a check variety, one can know the benefit expected from selection according to some specific characters.</p> <p>However, the reason why a check variety is used is not mentioned in the manuscript. Comparison with Arka Anamika is not done in the results and discussion of all parameters</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>EVALUATION OF THE PERFORMANCE OF OKRA (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L. Moench) GENOTYPES FOR GROWTH AND YIELD PARAMETERS</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive. Nevertheless, it could have mentioned the use of a check variety. Also, instead of citing max and min values, some emphasis could be laid on significant differences and comparison with the check variety, since the tables don't show marks highlighting significant differences. Some superior genotypes mentioned in the conclusion are not cited in the abstract...</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, but the subsection referring to quality parameters contain only one trait (fibre content)</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript is scientifically robust because it measured many growth characters and yield attributed parameters. It performed statistical analysis and revealed some differences that can be exploited. A specific genotype OPL-2127 has been identified for its highest values of some traits even compared to the check variety. Response of some interesting genotypes could be later tested in specific biotic or abiotic conditions.</p> <p>However,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Soil and climatic conditions details are missing in the M&M section. -The values presented in the tables don't highlight the significant differences, at a glance. No letters, no asterisk. Therefore the way the results are presented in the R&D section needs improvement. Min and max values can be used when the tables are expressive enough to show significant differences. -In discussion, authors are cited without details of their work or findings. It's not possible to check without reading the entire article of the authors cited. -The manuscript states that <i>variation in leaf area index may be attributed to the number of leaves per plant and the area of individual leaves</i> : correlation results would have been useful to confirm it. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :</p>	<p>The references are recent but could have been more. Some other references such as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - K. M. Dahal, S. Karki, G. P. Timsina, T. R. Chapagain, S. Pokharel, 2021. Evaluation of growth and yield attributes of okra variety - H. K. Singh*, K.M. Singh and Md. Meraj, 2018. Growth and Yield Performance of Okra [<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> (L.) Moench] Varieties on Farmer's Field. - Etc. 	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Yakoro Alphonse
Department, University & Country	Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Burkina Faso