

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 Achatina fulica
Type of the 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 <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
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.	The manuscript is important as author is describing embryonic development. The author has not well described abstract, material and methods and discussion sections.	
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 addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The author should rewrite this section.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Scientifically manuscript is correct but few short comings are available (for details see the review comments in evaluated manuscript).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References are not properly cited in text	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Abstract is not well described. References are not cited properly in text. Few sentences in manuscripts are incomplete. Material and method section is not well written: the author must provide location of sampling, number of sampling along with date or time of sampling collection, provide maintained temperature and humidity in lab conditions and also discuss typical environmaent in detail. Error reported in allotted figure numbers Discussion section is also not well explained and how author confirmed age of snail. Few sentences are incomplete in discussion section.	

Review Form 3

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:	Rakesh Kumar
Department, University & Country	Maharishi Markandeshwar (DU), India