

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_112708
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of post-harvest storage losses in onion genotypes
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, it addresses a current issue and a way to solve it. It has an objective regarding how to address the issue, and the methodology addresses that objective.</p> <p>2. Yes</p> <p>3. The first sentence has information that should be in the materials and methods section, in which it is not mentioned and is important, the rest is understandable, however it could be written in a way that is easier to read.</p> <p>4. The results and discussion are located in the same section; however, only the results are detailed, and it does not proceed to discuss with other studies. Therefore, that section could be divided.</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. No, more references are necessary in the introduction part, as well as more information in the discussion part with updated references Ochar, K.; Kim, S.-H. Conservation and Global Distribution of Onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) Germplasm for Agricultural Sustainability. <i>Plants</i> 2023, <i>12</i>, 3294. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants12183294 Robert H. Poppenga, Birgit Puschner, Chapter 34 - Toxicology, Editor(s): James A. Orsini, Thomas J. Divers, Equine Emergencies (Fourth Edition) W.B. Saunders, 2014 (https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9781455708925000349)</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes, it is appropriate	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work has potential, however, it is necessary to add more and updated information in the introduction. The materials and methods section is not well detailed about the origin of the genotypes, where the study was carried out, the number of individuals and why the percentage of outbreaks was considered if there were none in any genotype. The results and discussion section only talks about results, without contrasts with other studies in this regard, so the section is incomplete. The data in the tables may be more understandable if they were graphs over time and with the corresponding statistical analysis.</p> <p>I consider this manuscript to have potential. If the results are discussed in depth, including why bulbs were not found in the genotypes, it could be a good publication. I also suggest replacing the tables with graphs showing how the studied variables change over time. Additionally, it is important to provide more detail in the materials and methods section.</p>	

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nelly Abigail Gonzalez Oviedo
Department, University & Country	Yucatan Scientific Research Center, Mexico