

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_131515
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of stable Eri silkworm (Samia ricini) strain for commercial eri silk production in the climatic condition of Manipur, India
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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.	The research is important for the field of sericulture research to show the most important strains of silk -Eri worms, <i>Samia ricini</i> which are suitable for rearing in the Imphal, Manipur region of India, as well as knowing the most important seasons of education appropriate for each of the tested strains. This result can also be applied in other regions that belong to the same geographical location to get a high -quality cocoon crop	We thank the reviewer for their comment and we believe the Climate change influences the growth, survival, and economic viability of Samia ricini silk farming.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	May use one title of the following Optimizing Eri Silk Production: A Climatic Assessment of <i>Samia ricini</i> strains in Manipur, India. Or: Enhancing Eri Silk Production: Identifying Stable <i>Samia ricini</i> Strains for Manipur's Climate.	We have now modified the title based on the reviewers suggestions to “ Assessment of stable strains of Eri silkworms (Samia ricini) for commercial silk production under the climate of Manipur. ”
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.	Yes, it has a good abstract.	We thank the reviewer for their comment
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, it is scientifically correct.	We thank the reviewer for their comment
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	the author needs to modify the reference writing system as it is approved in the Advances in Research Journal and update some of them, edit the year of publication for one of the research and find one of the references in the results that is not present in the references chapter.	We have incorporated the changes made in the références as approved by Advances in Research Journal
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, suitable English language for scholarly communications.	We thank the reviewer for their comment
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The manuscript under review is excellent in terms of narrative as well as scientific material, knowing that there are some corrections that will show the manuscript in its best light. Therefore, I nominate this manuscript for publication in your prestigious journal after taking the opinion of the rest of the reviewers.</p> <p>PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</p> <p>No, there are no ethical issues in this manuscript.</p>	We thank the reviewer for their comment

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	