

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_122059 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | STUDY OF PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS ON GROWTH, YIELD, AND QUALITY OF RED OKRA (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> cv. Kashi Lalima) |
| 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. | This manuscript will play the significant role in the scientific community. Moreover, this manuscript will surely help the researchers who want to do research in okra. I like this research as it provides comprehensive information on okra. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | Title is not that much clear, better to mention the place of research too in the title. The title could be like this, " STUDY OF PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS ON GROWTH, YIELD, AND QUALITY OF RED OKRA (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> cv. <i>Kashi Lalima</i>) in Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India. | |
| 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 of this article is comprehensive. There is no need to add or delete points from this section. | |
| Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? | Better to mention sections as 1,2,3 and subsections as 1.1 or 2.1,2.2 etc. so that the sections and subsections can be easily identified. | |
| 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. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better to make some correction on title 2. Introduction portion should be little bit more 3. In statistical Analysis portion, better to mention the software where data was analyzed. 4. Conclusion should be well constructed. Beside this, the manuscript is technically sound and can surely help for the future researchers too. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. - | Actually, the references are not enough and even the references are not in proper format too. Moreover, there are no any Citation in the research. So the citation should be done along with proper referencing. | |
| Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Yes, of course the language and the quality of english in this article is suitable for scholarly communications. | |
| Optional/General comments | Work upon the citations . | |

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: | Bhuvan Joshi |
| Department, University & Country | India |