

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119310
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of seed physiological parameters of onion as influenced by different packaging materials and storage conditions
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>The manuscript "Evaluation of seed physiological parameters of onion as influenced by different packaging materials and storage conditions" describes the role of different storage methodologies and their conditions on the influence of onion seeds. Although it is a scientifically interesting article for the scientific community, the scientific article has flaws in its writing and needs to be better revised, so that it can be submitted to the journal again.</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>The title is interesting, but I suggest making it more objective.</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>The abstract is confusing, as it does not present a contextualization of the study, as well as the biological hypothesis pointed out by the authors. Furthermore, it is better to further explore the methodology, results, and finally, what was the conclusion of the study obtained? And how does this impact this scientific work? A correction is needed.</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>- Introduction</p> <p>Why do onion seeds quickly lose their viability after harvesting? Explain the information better.</p> <p>Why is humidity more influential on the viability and quality of onion seeds? Explore information better.</p> <p>The introduction needs to be better explored in the biological hypothesis, as this could help the reader understand why it is important to evaluate different post-harvest onion seed storage technologies.</p> <p>- Material and methods</p> <p>The material and method information were copied and attached to the abstract. This cannot happen. A review is needed.</p> <p>The methodology is incomplete, as it lacks references to the equipment used, as well as further refinement of information on the materials and methods used in the study.</p> <p>How was the design?</p> <p>Also, what was the statistical analysis?</p> <p>A review of this subtopic is strongly needed.</p> <p>- Results and discussion</p> <p>What were the containers in which there was a variation? The information is confusing and needs to be revised.</p> <p>What treatment? The results are mixed, and there is no indication of where a significant difference</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>occurred, as well as what the storage method was.</p> <p>- Discussion</p> <p>The discussion needs to be revised, and I suggest that it be inserted into a subtopic different from the results obtained. Furthermore, the justifications need to be better explored to make the language of this manuscript more explanatory and scientific.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Is a review of the conclusion about the best group necessary and why? And what is the impact of that?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>The manuscript needs to be heavily revised, as described previously.</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>References need to be reviewed, as this may provide a better view of what has been done in recent years regarding the problem explored by the authors.</p> <p>7. Keywords</p> <p>Change the keywords, as they need to better provide greater accuracy in the manuscript.</p>	
<p>Minor 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 English is confusing, and it is necessary to make a correction to the textual agreements. I suggest sending the manuscript to a publisher to review the English of the material.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Leonardo Vitorino Costa de Aquino</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Federal Rural University of Semi-Arid, Brazil</p>