



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJAHR_50043</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PRIMING METHODS: ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY TO IMPROVE SEED AND SEEDLING PERFORMANCE OF SOURSOP (Annona muricata)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

**PART 1:** Review Comments

	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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>The paper presents results on the effects of different methods of seed treatment for the seeds germination, as well as on the growth and vigour of soursop plants.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The theme of the study is not a new one (even recently, such a study was published in 2017) and as such should be justified, possibly by the specific local specificities of the biological material.</li> <li>2. Abbreviations must first be explained (including in the summary).</li> <li>3. In the Introduction section, the citation from 2017 is missing. I think it is necessary here as well.</li> <li>4. In the Material and Methods section, specify the determined physiological indicators, the determination methods (including formulas if applicable) and the corresponding citations.</li> <li>5. The author should pay attention to specific terminology when talking about germination and emergence.</li> <li>6. Line 94-95 ---- days after sowing (DAS)?</li> <li>7. Table 1. Do you want to say.....germination percentage....days after sowing (DAS)?</li> <li>8. Line 126....not seed emergence, but seedling emergence</li> <li>9. Line 158.. Curiously is the fact that your discussion has not considered the recent work.... of Singh, S.J. and T.U. Maheswari, 2017...</li> <li>10. Table 8. The values were fixed. What kind of balance did you used? Generally, the analytical balance is used and the values are.....for instance.....3.55.....; 4.22.....</li> </ol>	The manuscript has been modified accordingly
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Please take into consideration my recommendations.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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> <i>Thank you for the comments and suggestions. The study of Singh and Maheswari (2017) was considered in the study using the 500 ppm of GA<sub>3</sub> which is so far the best among the treatments used on their study. The treatments used in the study are different from them. Please see the revised paper.</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	None