

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122727
Title of the Manuscript:	Exploring the Concealed Treasure: Insights into the Genetic Variability of Crop Wild Relatives (CWR's) of Okra
Type of the Article	Scientific article

Comments

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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<p>1. You studied the accessions between and within species, however, all your data showed only percentage and number of accessions in all categories, did not mention which accessions belong to which species are in the same group or different groups for all characteristics. I found only two times that you explained about which species had which characteristics (eg.1. A. enbeepeegearens (VRO-W-EN-1) exhibited leaf shape type 1, while the remaining accessions displayed varying frequencies of different leaf shapes and 2. while only 2 accessions (2.15%) of A. crinitus showed procumbent growth).</p> <p>2. It is better to explain more about your findings to avoid the readers' confusion.</p> <p>3. It is better if you support the pictures/ photos of your data, especially, stem, leaves and fruit color variation, petal coloration, no. of ridges per fruit etc.</p> <p>4. All data shown in your articles only frequency data related to the characteristics, it will be helpful for the readers if you analyze the data for the genotypes. Consequently, the breeder can get information from your article to choose for parental lines.</p>	
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Khin Nyein Chan
Department, University & Country	Hungary