

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_121989
Title of the Manuscript:	SILKWORM PUPAE MEAL: A BREAKTHROUGH FOR CONVENTIONAL POULTRY FEED
Type of the Article	Review Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> 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>The scientific importance of this work is in highlighting the idea of using silkworms instead of using other choices of insects as feed. What first surprised me was the usage of the silkworm pupae instead of the silkworm larva because the pupae have less nutritious content than the larva. It then got more interesting when the paper explained that the pupa is a byproduct of silk production. The silkworm in livestock feed makes it a sustainable cycle where disposable products get used in essential food processes such as poultry production.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes, the title of the article is suitable. Maybe the word "breakthrough" is not the most applicable as we can find studies from 20 years ago about silkworms in poultry feed.</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 is comprehensive. I suggest the word "digestibility" instead of "absorption" as the other sections mention "nutrient digestibility" instead of "nutrient absorption".</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes, I believe so. I don't have anything to comment about it.</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 believe this paper needs to be improved to become more robust. The content, the citations, and the cohesion of the paper need to be improved. The graphs also need more information and quality. Please check if the bar graphs are the most appropriate for the situation.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Some references are recent, and some are not. I strongly recommend checking all references and citations. Further check in the citations and references will be necessary after first revision.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Besides the poor cohesion of the paper, it is improvable. A full revision is necessary to transform the English quality of the article and make it appropriate for scholarly communications. For instance, sentences such as "On top of that" need to be replaced for a more formal option (e.g., additionally, besides, and furthermore).</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Highlighting the positive aspect of silkworm usage compared to other insect usage makes a stronger paper rationalization. From my point of view, an advantage of silkworm over other insect usage is that the production techniques are in a more advanced stage than other insect production. For instance, a weakness of the Black Soldier Fly larvae production is the evolution of the production techniques. The downside of the Black Soldier Fly larvae usage is the upside of the silkworm pupae usage.</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:	Jessica de Souza Vilela
Department, University & Country	School of Environmental and Rural Science, University of New England, Brazil