

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	

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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript addresses a significant issue in sericulture by investigating the impact of Cercospora leaf spot management on eri silkworm health. It evaluates the efficacy of various treatments on the growth and development of silkworms fed with treated castor leaves. This research provides valuable insights into eco-friendly approaches for disease management, crucial for the sustainability of eri silk production. 2. Alternative Title: Impact of Treated Castor Leaves on Growth and Productivity of Eri Silkworms: A Bioassay Study. 3. Yes, The abstract provides a concise summary of the research, covering the background, methods, and key findings. However, it could be more comprehensive by including specific details about the treatments tested and their results. Adding a brief mention of the practical implications or significance of the findings would further enrich the abstract. 4. The manuscript's structure is suitable, with clearly defined subsections guiding the reader through the research process. However, minor adjustments for consistency and clarity could enhance overall readability. 5. Yes, the manuscript appears scientifically sound, with clear objectives, appropriate methodology, and statistically analyzed results. 6. The references are adequate, providing a foundational background for the research. However, including more recent studies on eco-friendly disease management and eri silkworm research could enhance the manuscript's relevance and comprehensiveness. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language and English quality are acceptable for scholarly communication but could benefit from some improvements in clarity and precision.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, the manuscript presents valuable insights into the effects of treating castor leaves on eri silkworms. However, to enhance its impact, the authors could consider incorporating statistical analysis details in the Results section and ensuring consistency in formatting throughout the manuscript. Additionally, providing a brief discussion on the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research would further strengthen the manuscript.</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:	T. Aditya Sai Srinivas
Department, University & Country	Jayaprakash Narayan College of Engineering, India