

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	Research

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>Yes</p> <p>Revise as suggested</p> <p>No, need to revise completely</p> <p>Incomplete and need to update as per the guideline provided by journal</p> <p>For now, manuscript is very poor in scientific write up; besides language and structure of sentence was also need to update.</p> <p>Old reference, add recent one, the structure of references was very poor.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of scientific write is not appropriate. Need to revise,</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This is an interesting study and the authors have collected a sufficient dataset, however failed to mentioned the details on methodology. The paper is poorly written and structured. However, in my opinion the paper has some shortcomings in regards to some data analyses and text, and I feel this unique dataset has not been utilized to its full extent. Below I have provided numerous remarks on the text as it is often vague. In several instances I also suggested to cite more relevant and recent literature. Furthermore, I made additional suggestions for more in-depth presentation of materials and methods, results and discission. Given these shortcomings the manuscript requires serious major revisions.</p> <p>Author/s are also suggested to go through the journals and approach to serious faculties before re write the paper. Also concern regarding scientific language and sentence.</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:	Tushar Patel
Department, University & Country	Navsari Agricultural University, India