

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 <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.	This manuscript provides valuable data on litchi genotypes, focusing on traits relevant for breeding programs aimed at improving fruit quality and resistance to fruit cracking. The findings are significant for breeders, though a clearer discussion on practical applications would be beneficial.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable. The abstract could emphasize the practical implications and include a brief conclusion summarizing the key findings.	
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-organized, scientifically robust, and technically sound. The methods are appropriate, and the data are well-analyzed and presented. Adding recent studies on litchi diversity and fruit cracking would strengthen the research.	
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 research appears scientifically sound and robust. The methodologies used are appropriate for the scope of the study, and the data are well-presented. The statistical analyses are thorough, and the discussion effectively compares the findings with previous studies, reinforcing the validity of the conclusions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are comprehensive and recent, with an adequate number of citations to support the research. However, a few more recent studies on litchi fruit cracking and genetic diversity could enhance the manuscript's depth.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clear but needs minor grammatical corrections. A brief edit for clarity and flow is recommended.	
Optional/General comments		

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:	Noreen Fatima
Department, University & Country	University of Agriculture Faisalabad, Pakistan