

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116883
Title of the Manuscript:	Bioassay Studies of Feeding Treated Castor Leaves on Eri Silkworm
Type of the Article	Bioassay

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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1- Yes, Feeding silkworms with diseased leaves leads to poor larval growth and disease infections, which ultimately reflects in the qualitative and quantitative parameters of the cocoons produced.</p> <p>2- It was suggested that the title be corrected during the review.</p> <p>3- The abstract was not written in the systematic manner of the articles.</p> <p>4- subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5- the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6- the references are sufficient and recen.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>language quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Make the modifications suggested in the body of the text</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Mohammad Ali Alallan
Department, University & Country	Syrian Arab Republic