SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Advances in Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AIR_40525**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A study on physical properties of okra seed: ABELMOSCHUS ESCULENTUS (L.)**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	In my candid opinion rationale for the research work is good. But, in order to improve the quality of this paper; thorough revision should be done as follows; 1. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was not reported so as to ascertain the effects of parameters evaluated on okra seed and their implications 2. Discussion was not mechanistic enough, practically all citations corroborated the contributors findings. Therefore, implications of the results obtained should be explicated extensively. 3. The conclusion did not support the hypothesis provided in the work.	
Minor REVISION comments 1.	1. I have reservations with formulae included in the paper, seems not readable enough and should be re-written. 2. I noticed that results and discussion as well as conclusion were numbered, I don't know, if it is the style of the Journal	
Optional/General comments	MANUSCRIPT FEATURES 1. Originality of the work Marginal 2. Engineering relevance: Acceptable 3. Scientific relevance: Good 4. Completeness of the work: Marginal 5. Support of the work by other references: Marginal 6. Organisation of the manuscript: acceptable 7. Clarity in writing, tables, graphs and ilustrations: Good	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***Akinyosoye Solomon Tayo***
Department, University & Country	***Biotechnology Unit, Institute of Agricultural Research and Training, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria***