

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122663
Title of the Manuscript:	Utilization of sericulture resources to value added products – a review
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	the manuscript presents a thorough examination of the by-products of sericulture and their potential applications. However, it could benefit from a clearer structure and more concise language to enhance readability.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title accurately reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. However, an alternative title could be: "Maximizing Value: Innovative Uses of Sericulture By-Products."	
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.	The abstract provides a good overview of the main themes of the manuscript. However, it could be improved by summarizing the key findings and implications of the research more explicitly. Adding a sentence about the potential economic impact of utilizing these by-products would enhance its comprehensiveness.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are generally appropriate, but the overall structure could be refined for better flow. Clearer headings and a logical progression of ideas would help guide the reader through the manuscript more effectively.	
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.	Regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript, it is robust and technically sound. The article is well-researched, with references to credible sources that support the claims made about the nutritional and economic benefits of sericulture by-products. The diverse applications discussed indicate a thorough understanding of the subject matter. Furthermore, the manuscript highlights the importance of sustainable practices, which is crucial in today's environmental context.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are adequate and relevant. However, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies that focus on the economic impact of sericulture by-products and their applications in modern industries.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sahibzada Ammar Ahmad
Department, University & Country	Khyber College of Dentistry, Pakistan