



**Paper: “Modelling Growth and Yield Components of Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* (L.) Moench) and Ayoyo (*Corchorus olitorius* (L.)) Using Multiple Regression”**

**Submitted: 27 December 2024**

**Accepted: 03 June 2025**

**Published: 30 June 2025**

Corresponding Author: Zakaria Issaka

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n18p21

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Tiendrebeogo Neboma Romaric  
Nazi Boni University, Burkina Faso

Reviewer 2: Blinded

Reviewer 3: Blinded

-----  
Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required  
-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title is clear

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

A well-stated abstract with few inputs required, as stated in the attached manuscript.

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

A few errors have been indicated in the attached manuscript for consideration and redress.

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods need to be updated according to the comments marked and suggested in the attached manuscript.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body contains some minor errors that need to be addressed. Details have been provided in the attached manuscript.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion addresses the objective.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Some in-text citations are not captured in the reference list. Old citations have to be replaced by recent ones. In the reference list, Authors must audit according to the journal's guidelines.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

4

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

*Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.*

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Accepted, minor revision needed

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

Authors should carefully go through the reviewed manuscript and act on the corrections and suggestions made.

-----

-----

Reviewer C:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

-----

**The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.**

The title accurately reflects the scope and content of the article. However, it is slightly long and could be made more concise for clarity and impact. A suggested alternative might be:

“Modelling growth and yield of Okra and Ayoyo using multiple regression.”

**The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.**

No, it is written in a narrative style. A structured abstract would improve readability. In addition, key statistical details are mentioned (such as  $R^2$ ), but significant predictors should also be briefly stated. (See my comments in the manuscripts)

**There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.**

Yes, there are numerous grammatical issues throughout the text

**The study METHODS are explained clearly.**

The methods are globally well detailed. However, the absence of a dedicated "Data Analysis" subsection is a significant limitation. The regression model is not fully presented, the software used is not specified, and no diagnostic tests are reported. Additionally, the sample size ( $n = 10$ ) is statistically insufficient for a multiple regression involving four predictors. The experimental design should also be clarified (e.g., number of replicates, randomization). These aspects should be addressed to strengthen the methodological rigor.

**The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.**

The body is informative but lacks structure in some parts. The results and discussion are merged, making it difficult to distinguish factual observations from interpretive commentary. A clear separation of the results and discussion sections would improve readability. Some figures and tables are not properly referenced or labelled. The statistical interpretation should be handled more carefully, especially when results are not significant.

**The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.**

The conclusion reflects the results but tends to repeat information from earlier sections. It would be more impactful if it included a critical reflection on the study's limitations (e.g., small sample size), as well as practical recommendations and future research directions.

**The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.**

Most references are relevant and recent. However, there are some redundancies and inconsistencies in formatting. Ensure that each in-text citation matches a corresponding item in the reference list and that the formatting is harmonized.

***Please rate the TITLE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the METHODS of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the BODY of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

***Please rate the CONCLUSION of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

2

***Please rate the REFERENCES of this paper.***

[Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]

3

**Overall Recommendation!!!**

Return for major revision and resubmission

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This article explores a relevant topic in agricultural modelling by using multiple regression to predict the yield of okra and ayoyo based on growth parameters. While the study presents interesting findings, it requires substantial revisions:

\*Clarify the experimental design (number of plots, repetitions, layout).

\*Create a separate "Data Analysis" section detailing the statistical methods, assumptions tested, and software used.

\*Justify or reconsider the sample size in light of the number of variables included in the model.

- \*Separate the results from the discussion to improve clarity.
  - \*Avoid overinterpreting statistically non-significant predictors.
  - \*Review and revise the language throughout the manuscript for grammar and style.
  - \*Strengthen the conclusion by discussing limitations and providing practical recommendations.
  - \*With these improvements, the paper could make a meaningful contribution to the field.
-