

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128746
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of post harvest ozone fumigation on storage of onion
Type of the Article	Original Research

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>

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript presents a relevant and significant study in the domain of post-harvest management. The use of ozone fumigation for onion storage addresses a critical challenge in reducing post-harvest losses, which is of substantial interest to agricultural scientists, farmers, and industry stakeholders. The findings demonstrate potential improvements in storage practices, particularly for a high-demand crop like onions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title accurately reflects the content and scope of the manuscript. No changes are recommended.	
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 provides a concise summary of the study, its methodology, and the key findings. However, it could be improved by explicitly stating the broader implications of the findings for commercial storage practices.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust, with a clear methodology and logical interpretation of the results. The experimental design is appropriate for the objectives, and the findings are well-supported by the data.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant and well-cited. However, the inclusion of more recent studies (post-2020) on ozone fumigation and onion storage would enhance the literature review's currency.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is well-written and generally clear. Minor grammatical corrections are needed to improve readability and ensure consistency in terminology.	
Optional/General comments	<p>The inclusion of more visuals, such as comparative graphs or charts, could improve the presentation of key findings.</p> <p>The discussion could better highlight the practical implications of the study for farmers and storage facility operators.</p> <p>Additional Comments for the Author</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract Enhancements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand the abstract to include specific implications of your findings for large-scale commercial onion storage. Briefly mention the economic or environmental benefits of adopting ozone fumigation over traditional methods. Discussion Improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elaborate on the practical applications of your findings, specifically addressing how 	

Review Form 3

	<p>farmers, storage facility managers, or policymakers can implement the proposed technique.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Discuss potential challenges in adopting ozone fumigation, such as cost, equipment requirements, or scalability. <p>3. References Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Incorporate more recent studies (post-2020) to provide a comprehensive and updated perspective on ozone fumigation techniques and post-harvest management. <p>4. Figures and Tables:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Add more comparative visuals (e.g., bar graphs, line graphs) to make the results easier to interpret. For example, a graph showing the reduction in rotting or black mold incidence across treatments would enhance clarity. ○ Ensure all figures and tables include detailed captions that explain their content and relevance to the study. <p>5. Language and Terminology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review the manuscript for minor grammatical errors and improve the consistency of terminology (e.g., consistently refer to "ozone fumigation treatments"). ○ Avoid overly technical language in sections meant for broader audiences, such as the introduction or conclusion. <p>6. Broader Implications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Highlight the environmental benefits of ozone fumigation, such as its eco-friendly, non-residual nature, compared to chemical alternatives. ○ Discuss how your findings could impact onion storage practices in regions with similar climatic conditions, extending beyond Karnataka. <p>7. Conclusion Section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Strengthen the conclusion by summarizing not only the key findings but also their broader significance, including economic, environmental, and practical impacts. ○ Provide specific, actionable recommendations for future research, such as exploring the efficacy of ozone fumigation on other horticultural crops. <p>By addressing these suggestions, the manuscript will be more impactful, accessible, and valuable to its target audience.</p> <p>There are no ethical issues identified in this manuscript. The study appears to comply with ethical research practices</p> <p>No competing interest issues are evident</p> <p>There is no indication of plagiarism. The content appears original and sufficiently referenced.</p> <p>The manuscript is well-prepared, and its findings contribute significantly to the existing literature on post-harvest management. Minor revisions to enhance the abstract, update references, and refine the language are recommended.</p>	
--	--	--

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:	R T Patil
Department, University & Country	India