

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_86172
Title of the Manuscript:	Cytotoxicity of Different Ages of <b>Weed Debris Extract</b> 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. This article shows results regarding the cytotoxic effects of plant exudates. It is an interesting topic, but I have a few considerations and suggestions to be addressed.</li><li>2. In the introduction, the paragraphs should be better connected. It is not fluid in its current form.</li><li>3. The authors should perform a statistical analysis. We cannot conclude anything from these results without seeing if the differences are statistically significant.</li><li>4. To obtain the micrographs in figure 2, what magnification was used?</li><li>5. The discussion lacks scientific depth. The authors are advised to add more information in this section.</li></ol>	A few adjustments have been made to the introduction for fluidity.  The sample size is not large enough for a T-test to be of any significance. The magnification of the micrographs are indicated already, below. More information has been added to the discussion
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. All the scientific names must be in italics. Please, check it in the text.</li></ol>	The scientific names have been checked and all are in italics.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript lacks scientific depth. The authors performed only one experiment to evaluate the cytotoxicity of the exudates. The test did not provide enough information about these exudates. Also, they did not characterize these exudates by any method. However, the manuscript could be improved prior to be accepted.	The exudates here are actually weed debris extracts obtained by soaking all the plant parts of <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> in water for varying periods of time.

### **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 involved in this work.