

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_122353
Title of the Manuscript:	Sustainable Bioprospecting: Utilizing Traditional Knowledge for Responsible Development of Insect-Derived Therapeutics
Type of the Article	Review Article

[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)
<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>This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it emphasizes the importance of preserving and respecting indigenous knowledge while exploring the potential of insect-derived therapeutics. By highlighting traditional medicinal practices, it sheds light on a rich source of therapeutic insights that could contribute to sustainable healthcare solutions. The manuscript's focus on responsible development ensures that this knowledge is not only preserved but also used ethically and sustainably. I appreciate the manuscript for its holistic approach, integrating traditional wisdom with modern scientific practices, which can lead to innovative and sustainable therapeutic advancements.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article, "Sustainable Bioprospecting: Utilizing Traditional Knowledge for Responsible Development of Insect-Derived Therapeutics," is generally suitable as it accurately reflects the content and key themes of the manuscript. However, if you're looking for a title that might be more concise or impactful, you could consider: "Ethical Bioprospecting: Harnessing Traditional Wisdom for Sustainable Insect-Derived Therapies" This alternative emphasizes both the ethical considerations and the integration of traditional knowledge into sustainable therapeutic development.</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>The abstract provides a good overview of the key themes discussed in the article, particularly the focus on traditional medicinal knowledge of insects and the need for ethical considerations. However, it could be enhanced for clarity and comprehensiveness. Increase the wording of the abstract.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be generally appropriate, as they cover a comprehensive range of topics related to the traditional medicinal use of insects across different cultures and regions. However, some areas could be improved to enhance clarity.</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>The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound as it thoroughly explores the traditional medicinal use of insects across various cultures, grounding its discussion in historical practices and modern scientific research. The inclusion of diverse examples from different regions adds depth and credibility, demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter. Furthermore, the manuscript addresses both the cultural significance and potential therapeutic benefits of insect-derived compounds, making a strong case for the integration of traditional knowledge with contemporary scientific methods. This balanced approach ensures that the manuscript is well-founded from both ethnographic and pharmacological perspectives, enhancing its scientific validity.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Remove the old references. Add reference according to journal guidelines</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communications, but there are areas where clarity and precision could be improved. Additionally, there are minor grammatical issues and awkward phrasings that could be refined to ensure the content is as clear and professional as possible.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Tasawar Iqbal
Department, University & Country	Institute of Physiology and Pharmacology, University of Agriculture, Pakistan