

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Biochemistry Research &amp; Review</a>
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>
<b>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.</b>	Considering the great nutritional and medicinal value of <i>Allium cepa</i> , the research presented in this paper is relevant. A special relevance of this work is the study of the influence of storage conditions on the content of nutrients in fresh bulbs. These data are important both for identification of varieties suitable for storage and for their further use in breeding.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The name corresponds to the content.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract is satisfactory	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript fulfills all the requirements for writing scientific articles.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form</b>	It is recommended to add references to work done in the last 5-7 years. Such references should be at least 40% of all cited literature	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The paper analyzed 9 physicochemical parameters of the studied onion varieties, which are illustrated in 3 tables and figures.</p> <p>However, the discussion section weakly analyzes the results obtained in comparison with the results obtained by other authors. A total of 8 references are mentioned in the discussion section.</p> <p>I recommend the authors to conduct a more in-depth literature analysis, provide references to the works of recent years. Add references to sources in the Introduction section (there should be at least 12-15 references).</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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

<b>Name:</b>	Svetlana Motyleva
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	Strogoorganic Online Gardening School, Russia