

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	European Journal of Nutrition & Food Safety
Manuscript Number:	Ms_EJNFS_124021
Title of the Manuscript:	Characterization of litchi genotypes based on flowering and fruit characters
Type of the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Knowledge the genetic variety in several blooming and fruit morphological qualities of different genotypes of litchi collected from different locales. It was expected to provide a simple and intuitive method of distinguishing litchi cultivars based on morphological traits, providing a theoretical basis for early identification as well as information for generating cultivars and optimal genotype maintenance. The genotype characterisation of litchis based on fruit and flowering characteristics offers useful information for choosing cultivars and promising types for breeding and commercial production.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes.	
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.	<p>-The abstract is written in the style of results and discussion, so it is long. For brevity I suggest writing the results for superior treatments (genotype) only.</p> <p>- Addition a brief 1-2 line conclusion to the end of the abstract.</p>	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	It is contain all parts of scientific manuscript from title to references.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but researcher/s have relied heavily on self-citation.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Authors are kindly requested to make corrections in attached file.	

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:	Ali Hussein Raheem
Department, University & Country	University of Kirkuk, Iraq