

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_ACRI_117892
Title of the Manuscript:	Chemical Communication Between Male and Female Sex of Bombyx mori
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.journalacri.com/index.php/ACRI/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>Yes, it is. The manuscript is important for scientific community, because the manuscript describe briefly and fluently about sex pheromone, start from determination, the function, , biosynthesis, mechanism of communication, what happen in male insect and the degradation.</p> <p>The title is suitable.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>The subsection and structure is appropriate. The manuscript is divided in brief structure and describe fluently, so it makes easy for reader/scientist to understand.</p> <p>Yes, It does. The manuscript is based on scientific research, The biosynthesis and mechanism of the sex hormone is correct. The references are sufficient and recent, but there are some mistakes. For example, a lot of references that did not cited, i.e: Anderson <i>et al.</i>, 2009, Bestmann, <i>et al.</i>, 1987, Choi <i>et al.</i>, 2003, Edmund, <i>et al.</i>, 2010, Harborne, 1993, Holldobler and Wilson, 1977, Horibe, <i>et al.</i>, 2021, Jurenka and Roelofs, 1989, Karlson, 1960, Kocansky, <i>et al.</i>, 1975, Matsumoto, <i>et al.</i>, 2010, Reguirer and Law, 1968, Saheb, <i>et al.</i>, 2005, Silva <i>et al.</i>, 2012, Steinbrecht, <i>et al.</i>, 1995, Tomid and Ishi, 1968 and Xu, <i>et al.</i>, 2012. There are cited in text, but there are not in references, i.e. :Adolf Butenandt, 1959, Ando, <i>et al.</i>, 1998, Butenandt, <i>et al.</i>, 1959, Englemann, 1970, Kaissling, 1987, Kramer, 1975, Law and Regnier, 1971, Peter Karlson and Martin Luscher, 1959, Rafaeli, <i>et al.</i>, 2003, Roefols, <i>et al.</i>, 2002, Samson anf Saheb, 1990, Schneider, 1992, Schwinck, 1954, Tegoni, <i>et al.</i>, 2004 and Yoshiga, <i>et al.</i>, 2000.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language is suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Please correct the word of B. mori and et al. The two words must be written in italic.</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:	Damiana Rita Ekastuti
Department, University & Country	IPB University, Indonesia