

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_116877
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of reproductive and developmental traits in new breeds and hybrids of bivoltine silkworm ( <i>Bombyx mori</i> L.)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for scientific community. Sericulture and therefore the production of natural silk is an area of interest both for the textile industry and for the residues resulting from sericulture production (chrysalis, fertiliser, etc.). The breeding and testing of new hybrids that outperform their parent breeds in terms of productivity is also of great interest to the sericulture industry and is also welcome. I warmly congratulate the chosen topic and wish the authors much success in future research.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is suitable.</p> <p>3. The abstract of the article is a little over-extended, but well done.</p> <p>4. Yes, the structure and subsection of the manuscript are appropriate for a research article.</p> <p>5. Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient (28) and more of them are over 2010 (20).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality are suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>I have a few corrections to make to the article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Duncan, 1955 appears in text and 1995 in the references.</li> <li>- Kumar and Singh (2012), appears only in text and does not appears in the references.</li> <li>- Sahama et al. 2021 at the bibliography needs to be passed before Sahana et al. 2022.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to those mentioned , I have made <b>some small corrections in the full article with the red colour.</b></p> <p>After these corrections, the article can be published in my view.</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>Mihai- Iacob Bentea</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Cluj Napoca, Romania</b>