

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_122989</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Evaluation of Several Bio-intensive Treatments for Uzi fly Suppression in Mulberry Silkworm (<i>Bombyx mori</i>)</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

#### **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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
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 addresses an important issue in pest management for mulberry silkworms, specifically focusing on the use of plant oils to control the uzi fly. This topic is relevant given the challenges in silkworm production and the increasing interest in sustainable pest control methods. However, while the subject matter has potential significance, the manuscript falls short in several critical aspects that impact its overall contribution to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the manuscript, is descriptive but could be more precise. Alternative titles could be: "Evaluation of Neem, Castor, and Karanj Oils for Controlling Uzi Fly Infestation in Mulberry Silkworms." Or "Effectiveness of Plant Oils for Bio-Intensive Control of Uzi Fly Infestation in Mulberry Silkworms ( <i>Bombyx mori</i> ): A Comparative Study". This revision would more accurately reflect the specific plant oils tested and their intended application.	
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 general overview of the study's goals and results but lacks specific details that would enhance its clarity and completeness. It would benefit from a more detailed description of the methodology, key results, and the implications of these findings. Adding specific data points and clarifying the significance of the results would make the abstract more comprehensive. Include a brief mention of the comparative efficacy of different plant oils and their specific impacts on uzi fly and silkworm health. Highlight the significance of the findings in the context of sustainable pest management.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure generally follows a logical format, but several subsections require improvement. The results and discussion sections need better organization and more clarity. For instance, separating the data analysis from the interpretation would help in presenting the findings more coherently.	
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.	The manuscript exhibits several scientific and technical inaccuracies, particularly with the nomenclature (e.g., " <i>Bombyx mori</i> Louis" should be corrected to " <i>Bombyx mori</i> "). Additionally, the experimental design and statistical analysis are not sufficiently detailed, making it difficult to assess the robustness of the findings. The lack of rigorous data presentation undermines the scientific validity of the study. Please ensure that the species name " <i>Bombyx mori</i> " is correctly referenced and notated as it is currently inconsistently presented in the manuscript.	
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 but could be updated with more recent studies if available. Ensure that all referenced studies are relevant to the topic and include recent advancements in the field. Recent reviews on botanical pest control methods in sericulture. Studies on the efficacy of neem and other plant oils against similar pests.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is generally acceptable but requires refinement for scholarly communication. Several sections need grammatical corrections and improved readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript presents valuable insights into the use of plant oils for controlling the uzi fly but suffers from significant issues in experimental design, clarity of results, and literature context. Improvements in methodological detail, data presentation, and alignment of conclusions with results are necessary for a more impactful and scientifically robust study.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Kamidi Rahul</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>