

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_95886
Title of the Manuscript:	Predisposing factors determining the rearing performance of Muga silkworm (<i>Antheraea assamensis</i> Helfer): A review
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is important for the scientific community. The article provides important information related to the silkworm, about the factors responsible for the growth of muga silkworms, about the geo-climatic condition and the forest vegetation of the primary and secondary host plants. It is important to know how these factors can be improved in order to improve their growth, including productivity of silk on the market, taking into account that the productivity of silk on the market has decreased.</p> <p>2. The title of the manuscript is suitable and suggestive.</p> <p>3. For this review the abstract of the manuscript is quite comprehensive.</p> <p>4. The structure of the article and its subsections are adequate, but it would be advisable to develop the subsections: Quality of Muga Silkworm Seed, Incidence of Disease, Effect of nutritional status of the leaf and Rearing Season.</p> <p>5. For the most part, the manuscript is scientifically correct, but due to some mistakes in the English translation, there are small mistakes that are not understandable.</p> <p>6. There are many references data that cannot be identified, I ask the authors to pass a DOI or WOS or ISSN to be able to identify them more easily and the bibliographic data are quite old. Also pass more recent bibliographic data, YEARS 2019-2022. For a review, the references are few and one of them is even repeated, as in the case of references 3 and 4.</p> <p>7. The placement on the pages leaves much to be desired, the manuscript is slightly carelessly made; I ask the authors to pay attention to all the criteria of placement in the page like font, type, tables, their size, etc according to the requirements of the journal. The sections should be numbered. Should be left space between each numbered section and its description.</p> <p>8. Would be indicated a section of CONCLUSIONS, where to indicate what would be the perfect climatic conditions, what is the appropriate range of plants for feeding them, the appropriate measures so that the silkworms do not become infested with diseases and pests such as parasites and predators (ants, wasps, birds), etc</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. The English translation has many mistakes, so please correct it.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>After completing the requirements and the corrections made, I express my consent for the manuscript to be published.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nituica Mihaela
Department, University & Country	National Research and Development Institute for Textile and Leather, România