

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121982
Title of the Manuscript:	Genetic variability, heritability and genetic advance in white onion (<i>Allium cepa</i>L.) for growth, bulb yield, quality and its component characters
Type of the Article	Original research article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is time and scientifically robust	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is comprehensive	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive though there is need for further reflection and improvement	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Separate results and discussion	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and current	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for the scientific community	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Few grammatical mistake found should be corrected given in comment box. 2. Character/ traits names given article text, should be in small letters. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Emmanuel Chikalipa
Department, University & Country	The University of Zambia, Zambia