

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_116320 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Assessment of Onion Varieties for Yield, Economics and Location suitability in Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh |
| Type of the Article | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

| | 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) |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>I finished reading the manuscript "Assessment of Onion Varieties for Yield, Economics and Location suitability in Anantapur District, Andhra Pradesh". In this manuscript, the authors describe methodologies to evaluate the quality of two variables of onion seeds cultivated and improved in soil, namely NHRDF Red-4 and NHRDF Red-3. Furthermore, the authors compare the efficiency of these cultivars over a wild one naturally planted in Ananthapur, district of Andhara Pradesh.</p> <p>Given the results obtained, the authors observed that the variable NHRDF Red-4 was the best onion seed to be cultivated in the region. Although the work presents scientific evidence that proves this, the authors need to better explore some of its results. Furthermore, the authors cannot state that these cultivars are ready for consumption since different genetic factors or environments can influence the quality of this product.</p> <p>Finally, for the manuscript to be accepted, it needs to be revised to create a better version of the work.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>The title needs to be revised, as this could make it more objective. Therefore, as a suggestion, I leave an example below:</p> <p>Assessment of biometric characteristics and yield of two onion cultivars in soils of Anantapur district, Andhra Pradesh</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>The abstract needs to be revised. It is important that the authors explore more about the importance of onion production, as well as the need to have cultivars with better genotypes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the authors need to bring the biological hypothesis of the study.</p> <p>Furthermore, what were the results obtained from the five places evaluated during each year tested? This information is important since the soil can be constantly influenced in each region.</p> <p>Finally, was NHRDF Red-4 better than the other onion variables?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>The introduction needs to be revised to present the scientific hypothesis of the work.</p> <p>Who are the variables? Why did the authors choose them?</p> <p>What are the health benefits of consuming onions?</p> <p>Are they suitable enough for all soil types?</p> | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>Material and methods:</p> <p>What were the conditions of the soil used?</p> <p>Furthermore, the authors demonstrate the cultivation of 5 different places, but do not present these results later.</p> <p>Can soil influence the quality of seed production? If so, how did the authors avoid this problem to make the experiment homogeneous?</p> <p>Results were presented throughout the methodology. It is important that this is in the appropriate topic.</p> <p>What were the statistical analyzes and experimental design used by the authors?</p> <p>It is important, in addition to biometric studies, to carry out genotypic evaluations to better confirm the quality of these variables produced.</p> <p>The authors highlight the methodology without references used by other researchers in the area. It is important that this is reviewed.</p> <p>Results and discussion:</p> <p>The results are confusing and need to be re-written. The discussion is weak, and it is necessary to better explore the scientific evidence obtained by the authors. I strongly suggest making the changes.</p> <p>Furthermore, the authors cultivate onion seeds in 5 different places, could this not influence the results and quality of the seeds obtained? Be clearer about this.</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct, although the corrections previously suggested in topic 4 are strongly needed.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>Authors need to review the references, aiming to better explore the scientific results to defend their approach and results obtained.</p> | |
| <p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> <p>The quality of the English language allowed for adequate scientific understanding.</p> | |
| <p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p> | | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Leonardo Vitorino Costa de Aquino |
| Department, University & Country | Federal Rural University of Semi-Arid, Brazil |