



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_34600
Title of the Manuscript:	In vitro studies of Imazethapyr and GR24 on early developmental stages of Striga hermonthica (Del.) Benth
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

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	Dear authors, I am writing to you regarding manuscript Ms_AJAAR_34600 entitled “<i>In vitro</i> studies of Imazethapyr and GR24 on early developmental stages of <i>Striga hermonthica</i> (Del.) Benth.” which you submitted to Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research. The central idea of this paper is a big relevant because it shows important results for a theme related to agriculture and world food production. The paper, however, needs to be improved. Therefore, some recommendations are suggested. Lines 20-26: You should not make this kind of description in the introduction. You can take it to the discussion, as long as it serves to enrich it. Lines 38-40: Repeated terms. You should use a cohesive element. Lines 45-50: This item is unnecessary, and could be explained later in the text. Line 65: What was the acetone used? Lines 71-115: the form of the text must be reviewed. It seems unsightly to start many sentences with the same word (“The”). You should use cohesive	<u>Lines 20-26</u>: You should not make this kind of description in the introduction. You can take it to the discussion, as long as it serves to enrich it. I am not agree with you because this is important sentence which describe the biology of <i>Striga</i> and their stages as well as this sentence described how can it established connection with the host vascular system as a results of this mechanism the parasite could derives its nutrients and water from the host. <u>Lines 38-40</u>: Repeated terms. The sentence is merged. <u>Lines 45-50</u>: This item is unnecessary, and could be explained later in the text. We believe it's necessary to explain the core of



SDI Review Form 1.6

	elements. Lines 124-144: The writing form does not look nice. The results are summarized as mere descriptions of the tables. You should make more comparisons between the results obtained. You've also started up a lot of the phrases with "Seeds conditioned" and this is pretty aesthetic. For the reasons presented above, I recommend a minor revision on the manuscript Ms_AJAAR_34600 entitled "<i>In vitro</i> studies of Imazethapyr and GR24 on early developmental stages of <i>Striga hermonthica</i> (Del.) Benth." which you submitted to Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research.	the laboratory experiment as a logical sequential account of the methodology. <u>Line 65</u>: What was the acetone used? It was Acetone, Multisolvent HPLC grade ACS/ISO/UV-VIS <u>Lines 71-115</u>: Yes please find my correction inside article. <u>Lines 124-144</u>: Yes please find our correction inside article.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		