

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_124734
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of purple blotch and thrips resistant lines of onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Botany, Genetics, and Biotechnology

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 article is important for a better understanding of the development of pest-resistant onion strains and also contributes to reducing hunger, as this research allows scientists and industries to improve food quality and its commercialization. Another important point is that knowledge on this topic is still insufficient, and the data from this study help to fill gaps in agricultural knowledge and cultivation techniques for the best strains	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Identification of purple blotch and thrips resistant lines of onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.) (Liliales: Alliaceae) I would suggest including the year the species was described and the full name of the author who first described it.	
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 summary is easy to read and understand; however, I would suggest adding more information about the onion. It was only briefly mentioned, and it would be beneficial to include a bit more detail about it. Additionally, the keywords are repetitive compared to the summary and title. I would recommend adjusting them, perhaps by removing the term 'onion' and the species name.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, As subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	<p>The writing of the introduction is clear and objective, which is commendable. However, I believe that the introduction could be made more effective with the following changes: (1) I would suggest reviewing all the references, as some information appears to be incomplete throughout the text; (2)</p> <p>I believe that the way the references are divided does not fully comply with the journal's guidelines. It might be better to format them as follows: (Vavilov, 1926; McCollum, 1976). Additionally, there might be co-authors for these works; (3) It seems that a comma is missing in the reference (Cramer 2000); (4) It seems that a comma is missing in the reference (Datar 1994).</p> <p>The idea of the introduction is good, but it could be improved in terms of the organization of ideas. For example, you could write more effectively about the studied species, as the reader may not be familiar with the morphology of the organism as you are.</p> <p>You might describe the external morphology in more detail and indicate the differences between this onion and others of the same genus.</p> <p>Please provide more details about the cultures where this onion is found.</p> <p>I noticed a brief description of the organism; you could elaborate more on these points. One suggestion for organizing the ideas is: (1) write about the class and then about the family; (2) describe the differences of <i>Allium cepa</i> L.; (3) then write about the objectives of the study; (4) and the location of the material used for the research.</p> <p>I did not find the references used in the study included in the introduction.</p> <p>Please revise the document, as introductions help convey ideas and also facilitate the demonstration of the study's relevance.</p>	

Comment [LP1]: I would suggest including the year the species was described and the full name of the author who first described it.

Review Form 3

	An introduction without references is like a text without a history, as we do not understand the problem being addressed or its contribution to future studies.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are good and up to date, but you could use some older references to show the reader that this organism has been studied before, though not from the perspective you are taking in your work. Also, check if the writing complies with the journal's guidelines. Should the year of older references be placed at the end or before the title of the cited works? Another point is that I did not find the following references in the text: (1) Abubakar, L. and Ado, S. G., 2010. Heterosis of purple blotch [<i>Alternaria porri</i> (Ellis) Cif.] resistance, yield, and earliness in tropical onions (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.). <i>Euphytica</i> , 164: 63–74; (2) Ambresh and Gowda, V., 2013. Studies on heterosis for purple blotch disease and bulb yield using male sterile lines in onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L.). <i>Asian J. Hort.</i> , 8(1): 68-70; (3) Anonymous, 2021-22. Estimate of Area and Production of Horticulture Crops. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, 85, Institutional Area, Sector-18, Gurgaon, Haryana. pp. 230, 260; (4) Mo J, Munro S, Boulton A, and Stevens M, 2008. Within-plant distribution of onion thrips (Thysanoptera: Thripidae) in onions. <i>J. Econ. Entomol.</i> 101: 1331–1336.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly, but I suggestd uma revision	
Optional/General comments	The main issues with the article are improving the title, changing the keywords, checking the references, and reviewing the guidelines to include the missing information. Upon reading the introduction, I found that there were no references; therefore, I suggest rewriting it to enhance the readability of the work and the value of the analyzed data.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lucas Pessanha Mousinho
Department, University & Country	Universidade de Brasília, Brazil