

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122727</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Exploring the Concealed Treasure: Insights into the Genetic Variability of Crop Wild Relatives (CWR's) of Okra</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original research article</b>

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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.	The writing is comprehensive. Good analytical work. Nice presentation of data. But, has some grammatical mistakes (must be corrected)	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title, needs to change the title (title appears like of a review paper)	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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 authors have collected the sufficient data and analyse in proper metrics. The manuscript writing covers all the details needed for the topic in a robust way. The details are well supported by self-explanatory figures.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are sufficient but it could be better to add some more recent references from 2024.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is suitable for scholarly communications after the said minor corrections.  Grammatical mistakes should be removed. Change in title. Some recent references should be added.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**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>Dipak K. Koche</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>