

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_97963
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphological Variation of Antheraea assamensis Helfer upon semi-domestication: A study on Rearing and seed production performance
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.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Inbreeding may lead to loss of certain characters in the insects. If it is related to economic characters then it become the topic of concern and hence, the manuscript holds its importance 2. yes 3. Can be made more comprehensive but snatching lengthy introductory sentences 4 to 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction ended abruptly without introducing the research objective • In the materials & methods chapter, the details of wild muga rearing host is missing but semi-domesticated one is reared on <i>Persea bombycina</i>. If the characters are to be compared, both should be reared on common host plants • Design of experiment, no. of replication, treatment and statistical analysis details are missing • Reelability of the silk is the main character which will decide about the economics is missing • Methodology not given for disease assessment • In results and discussion, what is the need to give notes on disease details? It is a research paper where the author need to say about the no. of samples collected of which how many showed these symptoms and per cent occurrence like that • A total of five figures were given but only fig. 3 find a place in the text. 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There is lot of scope for improvement	
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	S. Jeyarani
Department, University & Country	Agricultural College and Research Institute, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, India