

Review Form 3

JournalName:	JournalofExperimentalAgricultureInternational
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_JEAI_122559
TitleoftheManuscript:	Effectofsole andcombinationof foodplantsondegummingof cocoonandphysicalpropertiesoferi(SamiariciniDonovan)silk yarn.
TypeoftheArticle	

Review Form 3

PART1: 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)
<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>Importance of the Manuscript: This manuscript offers valuable insights into the impact of various food plants on the degumming process and physical properties of eri silk yarn. The study is significant for the scientific community, particularly in the fields of sericulture and textile science, as it provides empirical data that can inform better practices in silk production. The findings have the potential to enhance the efficiency and quality of silk production, which is crucial for both small-scale and commercial sericulture operations. The research is well-focused and addresses a relevant topic, which is why I find this manuscript to be a meaningful contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not, please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Title Suitability: The title "Effect of sole and combination of food plants on degumming of cocoon and physical properties of eri (Samiaricini Donovan) silkyarn" is appropriate as it clearly reflects the content and focus of the study. It accurately describes the scope of the research and the variables under investigation.</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>Abstract Comprehensiveness: The abstract is generally comprehensive, providing a clear overview of the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it would benefit from a more detailed explanation of the practical implications of the results. Additionally, the abstract could briefly mention the significance of the findings in relation to the broader context of sericulture and textile production. Including a sentence or two on how these findings could influence silk production practices would strengthen the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Subsections and Structure: The manuscript is well-structured, with distinct sections for the introduction, materials and methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. This organization helps in maintaining a logical flow throughout the document. The methodology section is detailed, and the results are presented clearly with supporting tables. However, the discussion section could benefit from a more in-depth comparison with existing literature.</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>Scientific Correctness: The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The experimental design is appropriate for the research question, and the statistical methods used to analyze the data are well-explained and justified. The study's findings are consistent with the data presented, and the conclusions are logically derived from the results. The use of well-established methods in sericulture research, such as the Completely Randomized Design (CRD), adds credibility to the findings. Overall, the manuscript adheres to high scientific standards, making it a reliable source of information for the field.</p>	
<p>Are there references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p> <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>References: The references are sufficient and include relevant studies that support the research. However, I suggest adding more recent references, particularly from the last 5 years, to ensure that the manuscript reflects the latest advancements in sericulture and textile science. This will help to position the study within the current research landscape and highlight its relevance to ongoing developments in the field.</p> <p>Minor Revision Comments Language/English Quality: The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but there are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasings that should be addressed. A thorough proofreading is recommended to improve clarity and readability.</p> <p>Optional/General Comments The manuscript is a valuable contribution to the field of sericulture, offering insights that could potentially improve silk production practices. It would be beneficial to expand on the practical applications of the findings, especially in the discussion section, to make the research more impactful for practitioners in the field.</p>	

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:	An-Chin Cheng
Department, University & Country	Chaoyang University of Technology, Taiwan