Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Annual Research & Review in Biology**
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	

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** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
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 provides valuable insights into the effects of different pre-treatment and drying methods on the biochemical quality of onions, a widely consumed vegetable with significant nutritional and economic importance. The findings contribute to understanding how drying techniques can influence the preservation, nutrient retention, and functional properties of onions, offering practical applications for food processing and storage. By highlighting the role of drying conditions in maintaining antioxidant activity and enhancing mineral content, this study supports efforts to develop sustainable preservation techniques for perishable vegetables. Furthermore, the research addresses the growing interest in optimizing food quality for health benefits, making it relevant to both researchers and practitioners in food science and technology.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Suitable Title Example: "Impact of Pre-Treatment and Drying Methods on the Biochemical Quality of Galmi Violet Onions"	

Review Form 3

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.	To determine whether the abstract is comprehensive, it should: 1. Clearly state the study's objective or purpose. 2. Provide a brief description of the methods used. 3. Summarize the main findings. 4. Highlight the significance or implications of the results. Suggestions for Improvement: 1. Objective Clarity: Ensure the abstract explicitly states the study's aim, such as evaluating the impact of pre-treatment and drying methods on onion quality. 2. Method Details: Briefly mention the drying methods (e.g., sun and shade) and pre-treatments (e.g., boiling water, steam). 3. Key Findings: Include significant results, such as differences in water content, pH, polyphenol, flavonoid content, or other biochemical parameters. 4. Significance of Findings: Highlight how the results contribute to food preservation or nutritional benefits, and why they matter to the scientific community. 5. Conciseness: Remove redundant phrases or overly detailed descriptions that might exceed the scope of an abstract.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct though the following aspects must be evaluated: 1. **Methodology**: Ensure the experimental design, pre-treatment methods and drying processes are accurately described and consistent with standard practices. The statistical methods (ANOVA and SNK) should be appropriate for comparing the data. 2. **Data Interpretation**: Verify that the results are correctly analyzed and interpreted. For example, the explanations for changes in water content, pH, ash content, lipid, protein, carbohydrate and polyphenol levels should align with established scientific principles. 3. **Literature Support**: Check if the cited references appropriately support the claims and comparisons made in the study. 4. **Results and Conclusions**: Ensure the conclusions drawn are directly supported by the results. The relationships between drying methods, biochemical quality and their implications for food preservation should be clear and logical. **Suggestions:** 1. **Terminology Consistency**: Ensure that scientific terms are used consistently (e.g., water content vs. moisture content, polyphenol vs. phenolic compounds). 2. **Clarify Contradictory Results**: Address discrepancies, such as lipid content differing from previous studies, and provide a robust explanation or hypothesis. 3. **Reference Validation**: Verify the accuracy of citations and their relevance to the findings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are relatively comprehensive, but the following aspects should be evaluated to ensure their sufficiency and relevance: 1. **Recency**: Most cited references seem to be relevant, but it's unclear if they include the most recent studies in the field. A mix of foundational and current (past five years) references would strengthen the manuscript. Adding recent studies that discuss advances in drying methods or onion biochemical analyses would be beneficial. 2. **Relevance**: The references should directly relate to the topic, particularly studies on the impact of drying and pre-treatment on biochemical properties of onions or similar vegetables. 3. **Gaps**: If any claims or findings lack proper support, additional references should be added to substantiate those points. **Suggestions:** • Look for more recent studies on the antioxidant activity of dried onions or the effects of drying methods on polyphenol and flavonoid stability. • Consider including references from high-impact journals related to food chemistry, post-harvest technology or agricultural sciences.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are areas that require improvement for clarity, coherence and grammatical accuracy.	
Optional/General comments	Here do not appear to be any overt ethical issues in this manuscript. The manuscript presents valuable insights into the effects of different pre-treatment and drying methods on the biochemical quality of dried onions, which is of great relevance to the food science community. The experimental design and statistical analysis are sound and the findings contribute to the understanding of how drying techniques affect the nutritional and biochemical properties of onions. However, the abstract could benefit from a clearer structure, explicitly summarizing the key findings and implications for future research. Additionally, the manuscript could improve in terms of language and clarity in some sections. In conclusion, the manuscript is scientifically valid but would benefit from revisions in clarity and conciseness to improve its overall presentation. **PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT**	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Soumik Samanta**
Department, University & Country	**Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya , India**