

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_128199
Title of the Manuscript:	Morphogenotyping of Spider <i>C. bifida</i> from Odisha, India
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript advances spider species identification by integrating morphological and genetic analysis, contributing to better taxonomic clarity.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Morphogenotyping of Spider <i>C. bifida</i> from Odisha, India," is justified as the abstract discusses the morphogenotyping of the spider species <i>C. bifida</i> , specifically focusing on its morphological and genetic characteristics.	
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>Lack of Specific Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract does not mention specific techniques or methods used for morphogenotyping (e.g., DNA sequencing methods, markers). This could be improved to better align with the scientific aspect of the title. <p>Sufficient Background but Needs Methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the background on the challenges of spider identification based on morphology is relevant, the lack of detail on the methods and results in the abstract makes it hard to fully assess the study's contribution to morphogenotyping. <p>Adding more specific results or findings would provide stronger justification for the title.</p>	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The data is scientifically correct	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Incorporate recent references, ensuring they are formatted in a consistent referencing style.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	That's acceptable	
Optional/General comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensure that <i>et al.</i> is italicized consistently throughout the manuscript references. <input type="checkbox"/> References must be written in a uniform and standard format. <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporate more recent studies into the discussion section of the manuscript before submission for publication.	

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:	Aakriti Shrivastava
Department, University & Country	Govt. Holkar Science College Indore, India