

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
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: 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 aids in understanding the optimal onion variety to enhance production rates. This study also aims to minimize storage losses. Being a country with smallholder farmers, it is essential to protect and store the maximum amount of crop until it reaches the hands of end users. This study assists farmers in achieving this goal.	Thank you for your relevant analysis.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable for the study.	Well noted. Thank you.
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 comprehensive. No alterations needed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Literature review is missing. Otherwise subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.	Thank you for the remark. However, the journal does nit provide a literature review section in the structure of the manuscript.
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.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodology, well-defined experimental design, and thorough analysis of the data. The authors have employed appropriate statistical methods and controls, ensuring that the results are reliable and reproducible. The conclusions drawn are well-supported by the evidence provided, indicating a solid interpretation of the findings.	We thank you for the quality of your analysis.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are not sufficient. Various formulas used in the study have no references, like the formulas used in Section 2.3.4 and 2.3.5 have no references. Also the formulas should have proper numberings.	The observation has been noted. The references to the formulas in sections 2.3.4 and 2.3.5 have been added and highlighted in the manuscript.
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	If the study had built on relevant existing literature, offering a clear rationale for the research question and demonstrations, it could have helped a strong understanding of the field.	The authors thank you for the quality of your analysis.
Optional/General comments	Overall the study is good, but missing some basic information, e.g. Literature review, references, etc.	The remark is relevant. We thank you for your contribution to improving the scientific 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)	