

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_125704
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the production and preservation ability of four varieties of onions ( <i>Allium cepa</i> L., Alliaceae) in Korhogo, northern Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Reviewer 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.	The importance of this manuscript for the scientific community is excellent as because onions are very important spices as well as medicinal crop. The authors evaluated the production and preservation efficiency of four varieties of onions in Korhogo, northern Côte d'Ivoire. The manuscript is almost robust and technically sound also. It will be useful and informative for students and researchers. SEE ATTACHMENT	The attachment has been received. Thank you for your analysis.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title of the article is suitable and appropriate.	We thank you for your appreciation.
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 of the article is comprehensive but it should be arranged as the journal format and some minor revision is need which I mentioned by red coloured.	The revisions you mentioned in red have been taken into account and highlighted in yellow in the corrected version of manuscript. Regarding the structure of the abstract, the example provided by the journal was followed and which includes Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of Study, Methodology, Results and Conclusion.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, subsections and structure of the manuscript should be arranged according to journal format.	Of course. According to the paper template provided by the journal, the sections of the manuscript are: Abstract, Introduction, Materials and methods, results and discussion, Conclusion.
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.	The authors wrote the manuscript according to scientific sequence by following abstract, introduction, materials and methods, results and discussions and conclusion etc. The manuscript is almost robust and technically sound as because they used suitable statistical analysis in materials and methods and also correctly discussed in discussion section with related references. Conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript properly.	Thank you for your comment.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and some are recent but it would be better if some more recent references could include.	The remark is well noted.
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	It is moderate but authors should try to improve English language quality.	Thank you for this constructive remark.
Optional/General comments	May accept after revision	The authors thank you for your contribution to improving the quality of this article.

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)	