

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_AJRIZ_117855
Title of the Manuscript:	"Genomic Innovations in Latrodectus Spiders: Advancing Sustainable Ecosystem Management"
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://www.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/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>1 - The paper in question, titled "Genomic Innovations in <i>Latrodectus spiders</i>: Advancing Sustainable Ecosystem Management", initially presents an attractive title; however, throughout the reading, it becomes apparent that it is a relatively superficial approach, lacking very relevant data. This is reflected in the absence of images, tables, or even graphs to support what the authors intend to convey. On the other hand, there is limited genetic and genomic data regarding the reported spider species, which justifies this review. However, I suggest the authors to include, even from the articles used, images, tables, or figures that justify the statements made in the current review.</p> <p>2 - Yes, the title is appropriate and suggestive of the content.</p> <p>3 - Yes, the abstract is within expectations; however, it lacks more relevant information in the results and a conclusion that better addresses the importance of the topic discussed.</p> <p>4 – Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5 – Despite being an interesting topic for the scientific community, the manuscript lacks genetic and genomic data, which it mentions several times. It would be interesting for the authors to add this information by using data extracted from the manuscripts that support it. It is also suggested to revise the English language in the paper.</p> <p>6 - The provided references are relevant and comprehensive. However, I suggest including some additional, more recent references, especially those related to the genomic analysis technologies and bioinformatics mentioned in the text, to further enrich the theoretical basis of the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The text has some deficiencies in English writing. It is suggested that the authors revise it to correct minor spelling errors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Throughout the results and discussions, the authors address the issue of silk weaving by this spider species. I suggest that the authors focus greater efforts on the potential applications of these toxins in health or medicine. I believe that this way, the manuscript would become more appealing and more relevant to the genetic and genomic aspects to which the title leads the reader.</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:	Sandro Natal Daniel
Department, University & Country	UNINASAU, Brazil