

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_126782
Title of the Manuscript:	ECOLOGICAL STUDY AND PHYTOCHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF <i>Ageratum conyzoides</i> IN THREE SELECTED STATES OF SOUTH-EAST NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this.	The author expressed systematic representation of data and results and discussion is written excellent. However some topological errors and keywords ,acknowledgements need to be improved.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here	comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Structure appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be	The author expressed systematic representation of data and results and discussion is written excellent. However some topological errors and keywords ,acknowledgements need to be improved.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dasari sravani
Department, University & Country	Aditya colleg of engineering ad technology(a), India