

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122932
Title of the Manuscript:	HEAT STRESS AND THERMOREGULATION: UNVEILING THE MOLECULAR AND PHYSIOLOGICAL RESPONSES IN INSECTS
Type of the Article	Review Article

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.	This article is of great importance as we are experiencing climate change throughout the world.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is good but I would like to suggest an alternative for this as HEAT STRESS AND THERMOREGULATION IN INSECTS: UNVEILING THE MOLECULAR AND PHYSIOLOGICAL RESPONSES IN VIEW OF CLIMATE CHANGE.	
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.	Abstract is well written. Do check the grammatical mistakes particularly use of [commas (,)]	
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.	The article is scientifically robust because it covers both physiological and the advanced molecular approaches.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient but in the reference section add the full name of journals instead of short forms	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Some grammatical mistakes are there particularly use of [commas (,)] throughout the article.</p> <p>Check the figure-1 title for spell of Software.</p> <p>In page no.4 give the space in Bumble bees.</p> <p>In page no. 4 check the Hydrogen Peroxide give proper subscript for the short form as (H₂O₂)</p> <p>In page no. 8 Check the spell of HSP family.</p> <p>In page no. 10 & 11 use superscript as (Ca²⁺)</p> <p>In Table-1 at serial no.3 rewrite <i>Musa domestica</i> as italic</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Majid Rashid
Department, University & Country	SKUAST-K, India