



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Agricultural and Horticultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAHR_50043
Title of the Manuscript:	PRIMING METHODS: ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY TO IMPROVE SEED AND SEEDLING PERFORMANCE OF SOURSOP (Annona muricata)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
Compulsory 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"> 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. 2. Abbreviations must first be explained (including in the summary). 3. In the Introduction section, the citation from 2017 is missing. I think it is necessary here as well. 4. In the Material and Methods section, specify the determined physiological indicators, the determination methods (including formulas if applicable) and the corresponding citations. 5. The author should pay attention to specific terminology when talking about germination and emergence. 6. Line 94-95 ---- days after sowing (DAS)? 7. Table 1. Do you want to say.....germination percentage....days after sowing (DAS)? 8. Line 126....not seed emergence, but seedling emergence 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... 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..... 	
Minor REVISION comments	Please take into consideration my recommendations.	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	<i>Delian Elena</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Agronomical Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Bucharest, Romania</i>