

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	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>

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 is significant for the scientific community as it focuses on improving the physical and nutritional quality of onion using ozone fumigation in various treatments. By incorporating ozone fumigation in order to reduce the post-harvest of onion, we can enhance the shelf life of onion. The author of this manuscript aimed to compare various treatments of onion with a control group.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is appropriate for the research study.	
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 should be concise and clearly explain the significance of the research in relation to the ozone fumigation of various treatments of onion in order to combat the post-harvest lose of onion. It should also highlight the superiority of the selected treatment over the control. Additionally, authors should discuss the potential impact of the research on the market demand of onion.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript needs significant improvement to strengthen the scientific research. It should incorporate a pictorial diagram or flow chart illustrating the procedure for preparing onion to enhance clarity. Additionally, the manuscript should review previous studies conducted by various scholars on the current issue of post-harvest loss of onion and the physical, nutritional quality and microbial properties of onion to provide a comprehensive comparison and ensure technical accuracy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The current references are insufficient and more citations are needed. Most of the references are recent. I recommend ensuring consistency in referencing by including DOIs in all references in a standardized format.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is clearly articulated and appropriate for academic discourse.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript requires significant revisions before it can be considered for publication. The introduction should emphasize the importance of ozone fumigation and reference previous studies on the topic that the author aims to build upon. It is also important to address the limitations of these previous studies. In the materials and methods section, the process of preparing ozone fumigation storage material should be clearly described, possibly with the aid of a pictorial diagram or flow chart. Additionally, the availability, accessibility, and affordability of this technology to end users, such as farmers or onion producers, should be considered. The subsections should be logically organized, with experimental design and statistical analysis included in the manuscript. The methods used to analyse each physicochemical parameter should be detailed with clear procedures, formulas, and proper citations. In the results and discussion section, the author should enrich the discussion by comparing their findings to existing research.	

Review Form 3

	<p>Review Comments The author's focus on the effect of post-harvest loss of onions using ozone fumigation to improve the quality of onion product is commendable. The manuscript is well-written overall, but it would benefit from more comparisons with previous studies. To enhance the manuscript, the following points should be considered and incorporated before acceptance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The abstract, while well-written, could be improved by including practical outcomes of the research work. Discuss the observed storage at different treatments of onions, the impact on other parameters, and any correlation between black mold and rotting. Simplify the numerical values in the abstract and focus on their significance and the community health impact.2. Arrange the keywords alphabetically under the abstract.3. The introduction section effectively highlights the importance of ozone, but consider adding a clear paragraph on the preparation of ozone storage.4. In the introduction, demonstrate the limitations of previous studies to establish the relevance of the current research.5. The first appearance of terms such as DAS and LDPE must be written out entirely before being abbreviated for subsequent appearances.6. Enhance the description of materials and methods, including sample preparation and ozone fumigation storage material. Cite them.7. In the section on physicochemical and microbial properties, explain each procedure and provide the formulas for determining total phenol compounds and the incidence of black mold, respectively. Cite them.8. Refresh the reference list. There are many outdated references, including Maude et al. (1984), Darbyshire and Henry (1979), Rutherford and Whittle (1982), Chang et al. (1987), Suzuki and Cutcliffe (1989), Darbyshire (1978), Rutherford and Whittle (1982), etc. Additionally, maintain consistent formatting for DOIs in all references.	
--	---	--

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:	Nesru Zeynu Seid
Department, University & Country	Holeta Agricultural Research Center, Ethiopia