Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JABB_118903**
Title of the Manuscript:	**MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS FOR DESIGNIING OKRA CROP IDEOTYPE WITH ENHANCED YIELDS AND STRATEGY FORMULATION: A CROP PHYSIOLOGY PERSPECTIVE**
Type of the 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy)

Review Form 1.7

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	The manuscript presents significant findings on the design of an ideal okra crop ideotype through the application of various plant growth regulators. The study is well-structured, and the use of Pearson correlation analysis and principal component analysis (PCA) to identify key traits contributing to yield is highly commendable. The proposed ideotype provides valuable insights for crop breeders and physiologists aiming to optimize okra production.	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	1. **Language/English Quality:** The language quality is generally good but requires minor proofreading to correct typographical and grammatical errors. For example, ensure proper use of punctuation and capitalization.	
Optional/General comments	• **Importance for Scientific Community:** The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it offers a novel approach to enhancing okra yield through the use of plant growth regulators. This research can guide breeders and physiologists in developing and managing okra cultivars with optimized traits for higher productivity. • **Title Suitability:** The title is suitable and accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript. • **Abstract Comprehensiveness:** The abstract is comprehensive, summarizing the objectives, methods, key findings, and implications of the study. However, including specific data points for key findings, such as the impact of specific plant growth regulators on yield, would enhance its clarity. • **Structure and Subsections:** The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical flow from introduction to methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. • **Scientific Correctness:** The manuscript is scientifically correct. The experimental design, data collection, and analysis methods are well described and appropriate for the study. • **References:** The references are sufficient and recent. The manuscript cites relevant and current literature. However, adding a few more recent studies on plant growth regulators in similar crops could strengthen the literature review. **Additional Suggestions/Comments:** • Ensure consistency in the use of units (e.g., ppm, cm, and kg/ha). • Clarify the timing and frequency of plant growth regulator applications in the methodology. • A brief discussion on the potential economic benefits of implementing the proposed	

	ideotype for farmers could add value to the study.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Johana Delgado
Department, University & Country	Andres Bello Catholic University, Venezuela