

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120588
Title of the Manuscript:	Reproduction and follow-up of embryonic development of <i>Achatina fulica</i>
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://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

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important to the scientific community. By means of the studies and research carried out in this article, the aim is to find solutions for solving the problems related to reproduction and follow-up of embryonic development of <i>Achatina fulica</i> .	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Reproduction and follow-up of embryonic development of <i>Achatina fulica</i> " is correctly	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is well structured and readable.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript is adequate and scientifically correct. The sentences are short, simple and attractive.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The content, methods, discussion, results, conclusions is in the field. The 4 series of figures shown are representative of the article.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	The reference list includes 8 bibliographic titles.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of english language of this article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Radu Daniela
Department, University & Country	Romania