

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119122
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of packaging materials and storage conditions on seed biochemical parameters during storage in onion seed (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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. The manuscript is important to the community within the specified area or field.</p> <p>2. The title of the article of suitable since the title described what the study is all about.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is concisely written with clear enumeration of salient findings.</p> <p>4. The formatting of the manuscript was appropriately written. However, uniform indention in references was not observed which requires revision in that part.</p> <p>5. Though the scope of study was limited to amylase and catalase activities of the sample onion seed, the results of the experiment was clearly described per procedure conducted by the researcher.</p> <p>6. The references used by the author are more than 2 decades old and some are even older. Onion is a well research area of study, It is a must that the author replace the current references with more recent research findings that will clearly shed lights on the topic.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. In a scale of 1 to 10, I will give the paper a score of 8 since there were few errors in grammar and there were words which should not have been in capital letter. Over-all, the article was communicated in scholarly manner.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Since the type of onion seeds 2 decades ago may not the same as the seeds tested in this experiment, other factors affecting the aging of the sample seeds could have been retested as guided by the previous studies.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Angelica O. Cortez
Department, University & Country	Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology (NEUST), Philippines