

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_86172
Title of the Manuscript:	Cytotoxicity of Different Ages of Exudates of <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> (Billy Goat Weed) using <i>Allium cepa</i> L. Assay
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:

(<https://www.journalajbgmb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/editorial-policy>)

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	I would like to suggest: 1. In the title of manuscript, you have mentioned clearly cytotoxic activity, But in the methodology , there was no connection in the mentioned activity, 2. What is the % yield of plant exudates (<i>Ageratum conyzoides</i>) after 24 hour, 72 hours and 120 hours. 3. Please re-write the methodology with clarity	The cytological procedure is shown in the methodology. The exudate refers to the same weight of weed debris extract, but after different soaking periods, so the percentage yield of exudate cannot be quantified. The method has been made clearer.
Minor REVISION comments	Discussion Part: 1. It is necessary to mention, what types of phenolic compounds presents in <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> prevent plant growth.(Be specific)because phenolic compounds are having wider range of therapeutic activity. 2. Need some clarity in the discussion part	The phenolic compounds present in A. conyzoides have been indicated. The discussion has been made clearer.
Optional/General comments	Result and discussion part, need to be verify and required proper justification	Result and discussion have been verified and reconciled.

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	There are no ethical issues in this work.