

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_129698
Title of the Manuscript:	Physicochemical and biochemical changes in fresh onion (<i>Allium cepa</i> L., Alliaceae) bulbs produced from four dry-seasonal varieties in Korhogo, northern Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the Article	Original 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>

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.	The present study is very useful in the onion industry in providing appropriate post harvest handling in maintaining the nutritional and non-nutrient properties Major revision is necessary. recomputing the values in dry weight basis prior to stat to draw a more conclusive information.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should also capture the Physical properties are not established in the present study, the study focuses on the phenolic and antioxidant properties	
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 can be improved by including the GAP to be addressed by the present study Include the statistical used in the methodology not in the results Most of the elements needed for the Abstract are available except the Gap	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Are the values presented in dry weight (DW) or MOISTURE FREE basis? If not please consider presenting in dw basis and re-run the statistics	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript is written appropriately with good English proficiency.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Consistency in the utilization of significant figure in the table and utilization of superscript based on the post hoc test is highly recommended In the experimental method, the number of trials are not defined per treatment. Pls clarify	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cristopher G. Millena
Department, University & Country	Philippines