

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Plant Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_APRJ_114303
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF TRANSPLANTING DATE AND HARVESTING PERIOD ON BULB PRODUCTION OF WINTER ONION
Type of the Article	Research Articles

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1- The manuscript is important to the scientific community, mainly in a national place. however, the manuscript has some issues throughout the text. the statistical analysis needs to be reviewed. the experiment is clearly a three-factor experiment (years - transplant and harvest periods), however, the all the statistical analysis was performed as two-factor experiment. Therefore, all the results and discussion also need to be reviewed. two options - use a three-factor experiment or used the average of the years of production to use a two-factor experiment. I think that a new role version of the paper might be accepted</p> <p>2 – Suggestion - EFFECT OF TRANSPLANTING AND HARVESTING PERIOD ON BULB PRODUCTION OF ONION (Allium cepa L.)</p> <p>3- The abstract is comprehensive, however its needs to be rewritten by the factors explained before</p> <p>4- The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. However, there need to be improvements in the text in function of future alterations in the statistical analysis.</p> <p>5- No, the statistical analysis needs to be reviewed.</p> <p>6- The number of references is ok; some few need to be refreshed and some references from others worldwide need to be added to improve the paper.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The English level of the text is good. I recommend a minor review together with the possible alterations in the text</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Guilherme Amaral Ferreira</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Salesian Catholic University Center, Brazil</b>