

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
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	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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.	I suggest accepting this original work with serious major adjustments since it gives readers no scientific value in its current state. The theoretical framework is promising but incomplete. While this manuscript addresses an interesting issue, it is not publishable in its current form. There are many major issues that need to be addressed before it can be published. Authors should ideally respond to every reviewer's suggestion in-depth, point-by-point. This work currently lacks any publication guidelines, ethics, values, and standards.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Its abstract was poorly written. There are many abbreviations throughout the text without any clarification.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The content is a collection of weak phrases, and the presentation is poor. There are occasions when this manuscript's language and sentence structures are unintelligible. For a good peer review, the article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. Throughout the text, there are several verbs and phrases that are repeated.	
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 theoretical framework is promising but incomplete. While this manuscript addresses an interesting issue, it is not publishable in its current form. There are many major issues that need to be addressed before it can be published. Authors should ideally respond to every reviewer's suggestion in-depth, point-by-point. This work currently lacks any publication guidelines, ethics, values, and standards.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The researchers only employed charts, plates, and graphs to convey their findings; but you should tabulate your findings statistically as you described in your methodology. The author failed to target and discuss the crucial parts that highlight the flaw issues in earlier studies on this subject confirmed by citations in the background section. To support the writers' conclusions and points of view, the earliest references should also be included in the current work (the list of references is inadequate and out of date).	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<p>There are occasions when this manuscript's language and sentence structures are unintelligible. This article requires extensive language editing and a complete rewrite. Throughout the text, there are several verbs and phrases that are repeated. The abstract, introduction, discussion and conclusion were poorly written.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The authors were unable to address the issue of study aims because the original content was so utterly meaningless and disorganized. I could not find a single cohesive concept or strong argument in your manuscript. There was no academic writing style employed during the building of this work. The majority of the scientific requirements (scientific standards) were not considered by the author when preparing, and drafting this manuscript (each section of your work). The authors raise many interesting points, which makes it difficult for the reader to follow their main argument. I recommend that the authors determine what their main argument is and structure their manuscript accordingly. A clearer theoretical stance will increase the quality of the manuscript. There was not enough rationale or organizing concept that I could find. The manuscript was composed in an incomplete state. The entire subject was disorganized, and I couldn't find almost any organization or explanation that seemed logical.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahira H. EL-Moslamy
Department, University & Country	Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology Research Institute (GEBRI), City of Scientific Research and Technological Applications, Egypt