

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124911
Title of the Manuscript:	Reaction of okra ( <i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> ) genotypes against <i>Rhizoctonia solani</i> inciting root rot disease
Type of the Article	

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It represents a study on <i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> , although in the introductory part it gives importance to the importance of seeds, their properties and diseases, where 30 varieties of seeds are evaluated under conditions to identify resistance to root rot. Although it contains a discussion, it lacks conclusions. Further clarification is needed in the methodological development.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Evaluation of Root Rot Resistance in Okra ( <i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> ) Varieties in (the study area)	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. Conclusions section is missing.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The robustness of the work lies in the evaluation of multiple varieties for resistance analysis of a virulent pathogen, in addition to performing replication.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some references did not appear in the word search; those references that are not cited in the document were highlighted.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It can be improved.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The conclusions section needs to be developed. The wording of the document needs to be improved.	

**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>Miguel Armando Lopez Beltran</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Autonomous University of Sinaloa, Mexico</b>