

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	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>

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.	The manuscript is of high importance to improve the onion production in India	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Evaluation of white onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) genotypes for growth, yield, quality and resistance to thrips and purple blotch disease	
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 need to rewritten in a proper way that express the highly exerted efforts	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes its, appropriate	
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 introduction is very week and lack the objectives of the study The materials and methods lack the methodology of assessment of pest and disease and lack the names and characteristics of devices used to measure some parameters. I expected authors to add some of other onion genotypes grown locally to compare them with the introduced ones. GPS reading and Climate data and their correlation are highly appreciated to be included in this study. Also authors should include the statistical program used to analyze data and its versions. The results and discussion section written in very week status which can be improved and written better than that to strength the manuscript according to the tables which consisted of very good quality data. The data presented in tables are very huge but its demonstration and interpretation need more elaboration and some parameters can be shown in diagrams and figures which can be better to be followed. Correlation studies are highly appreciated to demonstrate the different relationships of different parameters as well as weather factors. The discussion is very poor and need more expansion for various parameters. Conclusion must contain the recommendation of usage of the most important findings regarding yield and quality parameters and to give farmers the superior ones.	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are not sufficient, there are a plenty of work on the onion go to google scholar and you can download many articles regarding breeding and genotypes of onion	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality need to be improved	
Optional/General comments		

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed E. E. Mahmoud
Department, University & Country	Agricultural Research Corporation, Sudan