

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123735
Title of the Manuscript:	Effect of Methionine and Tryptophan on the Silk Gland Weight and Silk Gland Tissue Somatic Index of Eri Silkworm, Samia ricini Donovan
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 result of the work could be helpful for the silk industry, however, the reason for selecting methionine and tryptophan for the study should be more elaborated and discussed.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, No suggestions	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Yes, however mentioning the germplasm accession number or National Identify number for the local red petiole variety Castor taken in the study would be more appropriate.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Few corrections are needed Line 25: "Murugesh <i>et. al.</i> , 2021" may be corrected to "Murugesh <i>et al.</i> , 2021" remove (.) Line 106: Correct the authors name "(Moustafa and Elkaraksy, 1990)" as "(Mustafa and Elkaraksy, 1990)"	
Optional/General comments	Major correction required In Fig.1, the photographs of T ₂ and T ₅ are similar. Provide the correct photographs.	

Review Form 3

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:	Dulur Brahma
Department, University & Country	Bodoland University, India