

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125696
Title of the Manuscript:	Empowering Women through Sericulture: Transforming defective Cocoons into Opportunities
Type of the Article	Coceptual

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community by illuminating how sericulture, especially using defective silk cocoons, can empower women in rural South Asia. By connecting Self-Help Groups (SHGs) with the creative repurposing of silk by-products, it highlights an innovative pathway toward economic independence, sustainability, and social upliftment for marginalized women. I appreciate the manuscript's focus on sustainable practices and community-centered empowerment, providing both economic opportunities and environmental benefits. However, a broader comparison with other empowerment approaches could enrich the research, by providing further context to the unique advantages sericulture offers.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is suitable as it captures the core focus of the study on women's empowerment and the innovative use of sericulture by-products. However, a more specific alternative could be: "Empowering Rural Women in South Asia: Sustainable Livelihoods through Sericulture and Handicrafts from Silk By-products."</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive, effectively summarizing the manuscript's focus on using sericulture and Self-Help Groups to empower women through sustainable handicrafts. However, it could be strengthened by briefly mentioning specific outcomes or metrics related to economic improvement and community impact. Additionally, including a note on potential challenges or limitations in implementing these initiatives could provide a balanced overview.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally well-structured, with clear sections that support the flow of ideas; however, the lack of dedicated Methodology and Discussion sections limits the study's depth. Adding these sections would enhance the scientific rigor, providing insight into how data was gathered and allowing for a critical analysis of the findings.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by thoroughly exploring sericulture's socio-economic impact on women's empowerment, supported by credible references to existing studies and data on Self-Help Groups and sustainable practices in South Asia. Its focus on transforming silk by-products into economically valuable handicrafts reflects a sound understanding of both sericulture and its environmental implications, showcasing the potential for sustainable development. The arguments presented are coherent and align with known outcomes of community-based empowerment projects, underscoring the manuscript's relevance and reliability. However, incorporating a methodology section would further strengthen its scientific robustness by detailing data collection and analysis procedures.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are largely relevant, though many appear to be somewhat dated, with a few from recent years. Including more recent studies, especially from the past 5–10 years on sustainable sericulture practices, gender empowerment in rural South Asia, and advancements in bio-crafts, would enhance the manuscript's contemporary relevance. Studies on community-based economic initiatives and sustainability in the handicraft sector could also provide valuable additional context.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Refining certain sentences for conciseness and coherence would strengthen the manuscript's scholarly presentation.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Jain Jacob M
Department, University & Country	SRM Institute of Science and Technology, India