

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121948
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of date of sowing and boron fertilization on incidence of YVMV kharif okra.
Type of the Article	

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>

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.	This manuscript loses importance when the author uses sentences such as: "Okra (<i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i> (L.) Moench), often known as ladies' finger or bhendi, is the world's most popular vegetable. The crop is highly important in India, but it is not a major popular vegetable crop elsewhere." Furthermore, the author did not review FAOSTAT records, which rank the crop and provide data on land area and yield per country.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, the title is incorrect because it shows an abbreviation of Yellow Vein Mosaic Virus (YVMV), and this abbreviation is not explicated Influence of date of sowing and boron fertilization on incidence of Yellow Vein Mosaic Virus in kharif okra, <i>Abelmoschus esculentus</i>.	
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 inadequate because it uses abbreviations, such as YVMS and DAS T8, without explanation. It also fails to define the biological material and genotype. Additionally, the abstract does not specify the statistical methods used or the parameters analyzed. There are also other errors	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The author demonstrates significant errors in the structure of the manuscript. For example, 1.- The introduction does not present a hypothesis or objectives. 2.-The material and methods section lacks critical elements such as genotype, variety, and other important details. Additionally, the author includes sentences related to methods in the results section, such as: a) The test crop was Okra with crop variety –LILY. 2-3 seeds no. were put in the hill. The emergence of siblings was counted after 8 days of sowing. b) The plant population at 30 were counted in each treatment plot(4.2x3m ²) and presented in tables .2 c) The tender soft fruit were plucked at 3 days interval after 65 DAS. Thereafter seeing the tenderness of the fruit, it was harvested. Mass of fruit per treatment were recorded every time. Finally, all masses seemed up and converted to 1 ha and the data were presented in tables .5 and .6 ,fig2 3.- Results: a) The results contain several errors, such as data incorrectly presented in relation to the table (That is February 15th varied from 79.5% to 85.6%, correct is 79.5% to 85.7%, ; Under D1,7.65 to 17.03 in D2, correct is 7.65 to 21.4 and other)	

Review Form 3

	<p>b) It is unnecessary to show all data in the table, especially when it is repeated in figures and other tables.</p> <p>c) The manuscript uses abbreviations without explanations (PDI, DASRHI, RHII.) or improperly formatted terms like DA or OYVMV.</p> <p>d) The figures are poorly presented, lacking proper titles, axis labels, parameters, captions, and other necessary elements.</p> <p>e) The results section includes elements that belong in the materials and methods, discussion, or introduction (1: The number of plants per unit area (per plot) is the resultant of the quality of seed, the influence of soil, pathogens, and climatic parameters; 2: Plant height is an important growth parameter and helps in increasing yield by acquiring more sunshine and air, 3: Yellow Vein Mosaic Virus (YVMV) is a serious pathogen for the Okra crop. Whitefly is its vector, weather parameters especially temperature plays an important role in the transmission of this virus. The optimum temperature of 24.-26° C, helps in the spreading of the virus. The infected plant losses chlorophyll of leaf. Reduces plant height, leaf area, photosynthates, fruit size, and fruit density. Ultimately it also reduces the yield as reported by Sheikh et al.,)</p> <p>4.- The discussion is confusing and overly focused on soil and climatic parameters, while neglecting the impact of disease on the crop.</p> <p>5.- The conclusion is vague and unnecessary because the objective is not clearly stated.</p> <p>6.- References:</p> <p>a) The references are poorly written.</p> <p>b) Several citations are missing from the references section.</p> <p>c) Several cited works have not been properly studied.</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>This manuscript is not solid because, in agronomical science, manuscripts typically require three years of field data, or two years if the data are consistent.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>References:</p> <p>a) The references are poorly written.</p> <p>b) Several citations are missing from the references section.</p> <p>c) Several cited works have not been properly studied.</p> <p>d) Which reference is listed as Anonymous?</p> <p>e) References that are not cited include Bilqees et al., Brown et al., and others.</p> <p>f) There are issues with citations in the manuscript, such as Sheikh et al., Ahmad, or Ahmed.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Although my English is not strong, I can still understand the manuscript. However, the English contains several orthographic errors.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jaime Felipe Herrera Paredes</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Universidad Bernardo O'Higgins, Chile</p>