SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

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 The experiment has been well conducted and the key findings will contribute to knowledge in the area of study. The manuscript can be accepted after ALL necessary corrections in the sections have been made and author(s) complied with the format of AJAHR. **Colour highlighting code used by reviewer in the manuscript:** Yellow means the sentence is incomplete or confusing and should be rephrased for clarity Blue means spelling error or typographic error or change to lower or upper case Green means insert in the spaces indicated Red means delete item, phrase or sentence	**GENERAL COMMENTS** 1. The author(s) have not complied with the format of AJAHR in the preparation and presentation of the Abstract. Author(s) may please look up one or more copies of current AJAHR papers published on the internet or download the SDI paper template for guidance 2. Font size (Arial 11) was not adhered to in the manuscript 3. In the text, literature citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets and not by writing out the names and dates. 4. Also literature cited should be numbered in the order that they appear in the text 5. When citing 2 or more literature in the text in support of a statement made, kindly ensure that earlier publications come before more current ones as this shows that research is still on-going in the study area and could also indicate progress being made e.g. Gonzalez *et al*. (2005) and Singh and Maheswari (2017) NOT Singh and Maheswari (2017) and Gonzalez *et al*. (2005) 6. Author(s) need to comply with the AJAHR format in the Reference section **ABSTRACT** There are a few errors in the Abstract which have been corrected in the manuscript to reflect actual findings of the study. **INTRODUCTION** 1. Fairly well written. Perhaps the author(s) may wish to mention specifically (a) how long it takes for untreated sousop seeds to germinate (b) the germination percentage ordinarily; and (c) how much delay in seedling growth rate there is before the seedlings can be safely transplanted for optimum establishment in the field to further strengthen their arguments and rationale for their study. **MATERIALS AND METHODS** 1. Author(s) should please itemize ALL the data collected in this section and also explain how seed vigour index is computed. Measuring root length must have involved some destructive sampling; please state how this was done. In addition mention the time of documenting shoot length and root length data. Also please state when fresh wt and oven dry wt were taken if at the end of the experiment at 50DAE? 2. Was the overall total number of polythene bags used 20 x 4 x 3 = 240? **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION** 1. There are 2 similar earlier studies on soursop cited in the reference section published in 2013 and 2014. One would have expected some more in-depth level of comparison of findings in those studies with the findings in this more recent study but these have been sketchy. 2. The author(s) have chosen to present data of continuous variables like plant height, germination % and number of leaves over time in tabular format rather than in graphs (figures) which is the convention because graphs show patterns/ types of response better for such data at a glance. Perhaps they may take note of this in future manuscripts. 3. Confidence level for testing any hypothesis is first at 5% (*P =.05*) when it is said to be significant before 1% (*P=.01*) when it becomes highly significant. Author(s) should please use these terms appropriately and correct this in the manuscript and avoid placing (*P=.01*) before (*P=.05*) or mixing up both in the same sentence when explaining results as seen in the sections for plant height and number of leaves per seedling. Please kindly effect the correction under number of leaves as the reviewer has tried to do for plant height. 4. Please kindly move Table 5 from Shoot Length and Root Length and place under Leaf Length 5. What could be the reason for the sudden reduction in length of leaves produced by seeds primed with hormone at 40DAE (4.95cm) and 50DAE (5.69cm) from their length at 30DAE (6.14cm) in Table 5. Could it be typo error? 6. **Author(s) measured plant height then shoot length and again seedling length**. The reviewer is hard pressed to find a major distinction in all three parameters for a tree crop that is still at seedling stage less than 2 months after emergence with not more than an average of 4-5leaves. Suggest therefore that the section on seedling length (3.7) please be expunged as it does not contribute any additional information to the study. In this section, seedling vigour is mentioned but no data provided. Seedling vigour is certainly more than length of seedlings.	

	7. In the section on fresh and dry weights, author(s) may wish to take a second look at the alphabets attached to the figures of fresh weights in Table 8 and make necessary correction. Hormonal priming is 5g, halopriming & hydro priming are both 4g each, so 5 & 4 cannot be the same in one instance and different in another unless there are fractions that have not been included, in which case they should be. Otherwise perhaps it should read 5^a 4^a 4^a 3^b? **CONCLUSION** The conclusions as amended are in line with the findings of the study **REFERENCES** 1. Author(s) need to comply with the format of AJAHR 2. The few typos / spelling errors should please be corrected 3. This literature "EL-Barghathi, M.F. and El-Bakkosh, A. 2005" was cited but in the reference section it is stated as (in press). Surely after 14 years it should be out in print. If it cannot be found in print, then it should be replaced with a more current study that can be sighted. 4. The reference on Okoli, *et al* 2013 is given in this section as undated ; please kindly correct to read 2013.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	***Victoria Wilson***
Department, University & Country	***Rivers State University, Nigeria***