

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_122110
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on Medicinal Value of Silkworm product and By-products
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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>
<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>(i) This review is very important as it highlighted the medicinal importance of silkworm products and its by-products.</p> <p>(ii) This review has provided alternative and readily available means of managing non-communicable diseases such as cancer, diabetes and liver disease. This will enable people to employ silkworm products and its by-products for the management of these diseases.</p> <p>(iii) The review also highlighted the nutritional values of silkworm products and its by-products, which is very relevant.</p> <p>(iv) Lastly, this review article has indirectly provided ways of managing waste from silkworm.</p> <p>Although, this review article is good, the review should be extensive.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of this article is suitable.</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>Yes, the abstract of this article is comprehensive.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The structure of the manuscript needs some revisions.</p> <p>The author (s) should include a subsection discussing the chemical compositions of silkworm products and its by-products.</p> <p>Appropriate images should be added.</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>(i) The author (s) provided relevant literature and references to buttress their points.</p> <p>(ii) The author (s) provided a review that addresses important issues of health concerns.</p> <p>(iii) Scientific terms associated with the topic for this review have been used appropriately.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>Yes, the references are recent but not are not sufficient.</p> <p>Reference 3 is incomplete.</p> <p>The name of the Journal for reference 9 and 10 should be written in full.</p> <p>The name of the Journals should be italicized for reference 12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19 and 20.</p> <p>The number of references for this review are not within 50-150 references per the Journal's guidelines. In order to meet this requirement, the review should be extensive.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English language quality is suitable but needs reconstruction of sentences, and appropriate use of punctuations. The author (s) should also correct grammatical errors.</p> <p>The author (s) should check the Introduction section of the manuscript, particularly line 2- mainl should be corrected to “mainly” and the statement should be changed to “Sericulture mainly involves the rearing of silkworms for the production of different types of silkworms.</p> <p>The spelling of by-products should be consistent throughout the manuscript. Proteic extract should be changed to “Protein extract”</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The advisable length for review articles published in this journal is 5000-9000 words. However, the length for this review article is 2781. This should be addressed.</p>	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Richard Sedeavor
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana