

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology.
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_117021
Title of the Manuscript:	The study of variability heritability and genetic advance in okra [(<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> L.) Moench] crop
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://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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)
<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. The manuscript is very useful to enhance global vegetable security.</p> <p>2. It is suitable after some corrections.</p> <p>3. The abstract is appropriate and comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Subsections are nicely and properly explained.</p> <p>5. Appropriately defined and statistically supported well.</p> <p>6. References are relevant and adequate, but arrangement should be revised. A lot of references are not cited in references, whereas, i=those are cited im manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is quite correct and appropriate, hence well suitable to scholarly communication. However, some minor corrections are required.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the research article is very informative and useful, after some corrections.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	J. H. Vachhani
Department, University & Country	Junagadh Agricultural University, India