

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123085
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Intercharacter Relationships among Agronomic Traits of Diverse Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> (L.) Moench) Collections in Coastal Regions of Tamil Nadu
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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>For improvement purpose, evaluation of genotypes and characters relationships is a key step. The manuscript is important because it provides knowledge about Okra genotypes and helps understand what how improvement could be conducted. It also identified some traits with direct effects on fruit yield which can lead to superior okra cultivars selection.</p> <p>However,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the list of the 48 accessions is not mentioned -correlations between traits are not enough studied and discussed; only correlation with yield is -there is no data about the accessions' performances -fruit girth is sometimes fruit thickness -some sentences could be moved -conclusion needs improvement in order to say what is the valuable results of this study and the way forward 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title only mentions intercharacter relationships and collections while in the paper there isn't clearly collections, and the relationships studied are clearly correlations and path coefficients.</p> <p>It could be suggested "Correlation and path analysis of association among some agronomic traits in Okra accessions grown in Coastal regions of Tamil Nadu"</p>	
<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.</p>	<p>Yes But</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the experimental conditions are not mentioned -its conclusion deals with different agro-ecological zones while the study didn't address this topic 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Material and methods could have mentioned subsections dealing with the plant material (48 accessions and their origin) and experimental conditions, observations, correlation and path analysis with some details.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Not robust enough because the correlation studied limited at the correlation between yield and some other parameters. Relationships among each character with an other are not detailed while they could have highlighted some findings and allow valuable discussion with relevant references. Path analysis would have also been detailed with all the characters effects and also represented in a diagram for better understanding.</p> <p>Since performances of the accessions are not presented in the paper it would have been better to detail enough the intercharacter relationships and path analysis considering each character and discuss with references</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Yakoro Alphonse
Department, University & Country	Université Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Burkina Faso