

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_114869</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Cordyceps militaris on Silkworm Pupae: A Potential Platform for Synthesis of Cordycepin with Anti-Cancer Properties</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

## 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The present review manuscript discussed the use of Silkworm Pupae as platform for growing <i>Cordyceps militaris</i> and subsequent production of Cordycepin. The manuscript is somewhat relevant but lacks proper focus. Briefly, while the authors included "Anti-Cancer Properties" as part of the title, it was only briefly being discussed in the manuscript.</li> <li>2. The present title does not properly reflect the manuscript/ abstract content. Please revise.</li> <li>3. The present abstract only discusses the economical/ commercial value of using Silkworm Pupae as platform for growing <i>Cordyceps militaris</i> and subsequent production of Cordycepin. There was no mentioning of anti-cancer properties.</li> <li>4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is not appropriate. Please revise.</li> <li>5. (a) As mentioned above, the abstract and manuscript mainly focus on the economical/ commercial value of using Silkworm Pupae as platform for growing <i>Cordyceps militaris</i> and subsequent production of Cordycepin. The anti-cancer properties are only briefly being discussed.  (b) While the authors stated that silkworm pupae are a potential platform for synthesis of Cordycepin, there were no proper justifications/ comparisons to substantiate the claim.  (c) There was no mentioning/ discussion on the species of Silkworm which would be proper for growing <i>Cordyceps militaris</i>.  (d) The present manuscript lacks proper coherence and presents with patchy content.</li> <li>6. No comment.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The present manuscript requires further revision on English language and use of grammar. Multiple spelling and grammar mistakes are noticed.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ooi Der Jiun</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Mahsa University, Malaysia</b>