

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124170
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of white onion (Allium cepa L.) genotypes for growth, yield, quality, pest and disease parameters
Type of the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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 holds significant importance for the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive evaluation of white onion genotypes across multiple parameters, including growth, yield, quality, and disease resistance. The detailed analysis of various genotypes under different conditions offers valuable insights into the genetic variability and environmental interactions that influence onion cultivation. This research is particularly relevant for developing high-yielding and disease-resistant onion varieties, which can enhance agricultural productivity and food security. Personally, I appreciate this manuscript for its rigorous methodology and practical implications, as it bridges the gap between genetic research and practical agricultural applications. However, I would suggest ensuring that the data is presented with sufficient clarity and detail to support the conclusions drawn.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is generally suitable but could be more specific. Alternative Title Suggestion: "Evaluation of White Onion Genotypes for Growth, Yield, Quality, and Disease Resistance"	
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 generally comprehensive but could benefit from minor adjustments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Addition: Include specific details about the methodology used for evaluating genotypes.Deletion: Remove redundant phrases to enhance clarity. Suggestions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">Briefly mention the methodology for context.Streamline repetitive information to improve readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections and structure are generally appropriate but may benefit from slight adjustments for clarity and flow. Ensure logical progression and clear headings for each section.	

Review Form 3

<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness and technical soundness through its meticulous experimental design and comprehensive analysis. The use of a randomized complete block design with twenty-six genotypes ensures that the results are statistically valid and minimize bias. The detailed evaluation of growth, yield, quality, and disease resistance parameters provides a well-rounded assessment of the genotypes, supported by appropriate statistical analyses. Additionally, the manuscript's findings are contextualized within existing literature, underscoring its contribution to advancing knowledge in the field of agricultural science. These aspects collectively affirm the manuscript's scientific rigor and reliab</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are somewhat sufficient but could be updated. Include more recent studies from the past 3-5 years for a comprehensive review. Consider adding recent reviews and studies related to onion genetics, disease resistance, and yield improvements</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Language Quality Evaluation:</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>Overall, the language in the manuscript is suitable for scholarly communication but can be improved for greater clarity and precision. Addressing the issues related to sentence structure, grammar, and technical terminology will enhance the manuscript's readability and overall quality.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of agricultural science, offering insights into white onion genotypes that can benefit various stakeholders. Addressing the suggested improvements will enhance the manuscript's clarity, depth, and overall impact.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ahmad H.AI-Fraihat</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Al-Balqa Applied University Al-Salt 19117 Al-Huson University College, Jordan</p>