

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJAAR_88527  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Improvement of fruit pubescence and fruiting pattern among pure lines and Landrace of Okra ( <i>Abelmoschus</i> spp.) through interspecific hybridization |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajaar.com/index.php/AJAAR/editorial-policy> )

### PART 1: Review Comments

|                                     | 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)  |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | In <b>Conclusions</b> should be present the concrete data, in numbers which are the best results, obtained as a result of the research in paragraphs :<br><b>RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b> and based on the Conclusions, the Abstract also changes.  | We acknowledge the suggestion of the reviewer, however we wish to state that there is no basis to input data in numbers, since these are qualitative traits (immeasurable traits) which can only be scored or graded. For instance, skin colour, shape etc. Data was collected based on observation and scoring them according to their appearance of pubescence or spininess. Hence, there would not be any need to effect changes to the abstract. However, if the editor feels we should do otherwise, we will adhere to the request of the reviewer.   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <i>The <b>Keywords</b>:</i> should have been reformulated and to introduce some characteristic words for the paper as: <b><i>Abelmoschus</i> spp.</b> , varieties.<br>In the <b>Introduction</b> - all authors in the text must be checked to be included in the references and vice versa the authors included in the references must be present in the text.<br>In the <b>Results and discussion - the tables</b> must be included in the text as soon as they have been mentioned with their subsequent description.<br>In the <b>References - the authors missing in text</b> : Hirose, K., Endo, K., and Hasegawa, K. (2004); Ahmad S, (2002); Adeniji, O.T. (2003); Kalia, H.R. and Padda, D.S. (1962); Nath, P. and Dutta, O. P. (1970); Sengkhampan, N., Verhoef, R., Schols, HA., Sajjaanantakul, T. and Voragen, AG. (2009); Wammanda, T.D., Kadams, A.M. and Jonah, P.M. (2008).<br><b>The authors who are in the text but in references are missing</b> : Stansfield, 1969; Simmone <i>et al.</i> , 2004; | We acknowledge the suggestion of the reviewer by reformulating the keywords to include <i>Abelmoschus</i> spp and varieties since they are vital components of the work. Correction effected in the revised manuscript.<br>We acknowledge some authors in the text were missing in the references and vice-versa as pointed out by the reviewer. Necessary corrections have been effected in the revised manuscript.<br>We acknowledge the suggestion of the reviewer. The tables have been included in the text at their appropriate sections of description in the revised manuscript.<br>We appreciate the painstaking effort of the reviewer in thoroughly going through the reference section. The authors, Stanfield 1969 and Simmone <i>et al.</i> , 2004 have been included in the reference section. Also, the following authors as mentioned by the reviewer; Hirose, K., Endo, K., and Hasegawa, K. (2004); Ahmad S, (2002); Adeniji, O.T. (2003); Kalia, H.R. and Padda, D.S. (1962); Sengkhampan, N., Verhoef, R., Schols, HA., Sajjaanantakul, T. and Voragen, AG. (2009); Wammanda, T.D., Kadams, A.M. and Jonah, P.M. (2008) have been removed because their contributions were not needed in the work. However, the contributions of Nath P. and Dutta OP (1970) have been clearly cited in the revised manuscript. |
| <b>Optional/General</b> 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? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) | The authors wish to state that there were no ethical issues in any part of the manuscript; as such does not violate any ethical or religious beliefs of any group or organization. Another reviewer raised such concerns and our response is same as clearly addressed in the revised manuscript. |