

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120834
Title of the Manuscript:	Mating receptivity peptides in Helicoverpa armigera: Molecular and evolutionary perspectives
Type of the Article	Original

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 describes the evolutionary characteristics of novel found in male accessory organs that play roles in the induction of behavioral changes in insects after mating. The bioinformatic tools and programs used in this study are relevant. The study has broader implication for preservation of insect biodiversity.	
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 abstract can be more concise	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, subsections are appropriate	
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 science of the manuscript has merits, however the presentation can be improved on for precision and clarity.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	References are not sufficient. For example in the introduction there are several information that are not common knowledge that were lacking citations. It almost like only about one or two sources were cited in each paragraphs.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language can be improved on for clarity and precision. For instance, in the first paragraph of the Introduction. What does the author mean by "insects, the species-riches animal class"? That phrase is confusing, is species higher than class or kingdom in the taxonomic classification hierarchy? Are there insect species plant class?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a highly informative manuscript with potential significant impacts on preservation of biodiversity. The methods and analysis have merits. To improve the manuscript, however, authors should look into making the abstract, introduction and discussion more concise. Specific focus should be placed on just the results of the study and what it could mean within the body of existing literature in the field. Attention should be paid to simplifying phrases and sentences to avoid precise communication of ideas to audience.	

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:	Temitope Awe
Department, University & Country	School of Biological Sciences, Illinois State University, US