

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Annual Research &amp; Review in Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_129109
Title of the Manuscript:	Impact of blanching and two drying methods on the nutritional, organoleptic and microbiological properties of fresh onions of the Galmi violet variety sold on the markets of Korhogo (Côte D'Ivoire)
Type of the Article	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>

### Review Form 3

#### 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 research is very good and important for the community as a source of the latest information listed in this manuscript where onion processing will be a solution to reduce post-harvest losses during the abundance period. In this study, it is good which can reduce the population of pathogenic microbes. However, it must be said that drying conditions affect the nutritional quality of onions. The shortcomings of this manuscript are the lack of current references included in this article (5-10 current references).	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, it is. The title of this article is very appropriate and suitable.	
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.	Yes, it is. The abstract of article is very comprehensive. In my opinion, it does not need to add or delete some points of a section from the article.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is. The manuscript was written scientifically and correctly	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The cited references are not sufficient and still very few use the latest references. In my opinion, I suggest adding 10 years of additional references taken in the latest journals and included in this manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is. The language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I suggest adding recent references to this manuscript.</p> <p>No, there are not competing interest issues in this manuscript No, there are not ethical issues in this manuscript</p> <p>This manuscript is very good and appropriate and the content is very interesting so that the article is accepted but with the condition that this manuscript needs to be revised.</p>	

#### 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:	Chairil Anwar
Department, University & Country	Politeknik Indonesia Venezuela, Indonesia