

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Plant &amp; Soil Science</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPSS_112708</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Estimation of post-harvest storage losses in onion genotypes</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original</b>

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Compulsory revisions are required for reconsideration and additional comments are indicated in MS word track changes. Summary of the comments by section: comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Title</b> Needs modification towards physiological loses</li> <li><b>Abstract:</b> Minor correction is needed.</li> <li><b>Introduction-</b> Ok</li> <li><b>Materials and Method: Was not well described and stated. It should be clearly stated. See the comments in the document</b></li> <li><b>Result and discussion:-</b> -The results in each Table should be described consequently. The discussion is also shallow. Thus, requires some additional recent and relevant references</li> <li><b>References-</b>was not prepared according to the journal's format. The number of references are few. Thus it is good if some additional references are incorporated</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ok</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The study identified some useful onion genotypes with longer shelf life as compared to other. As long as minor revisions are made based on the comments and suggestions given, I suggest the reconsideration of the paper for publication.</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zerihun Jalata</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Wollega University, Ethiopia</b>