



### REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 56794

**Title: Evaluation of Ocimum Sanctum Leaf Extract Performance On, Cocoon production and Silk Quality in Bombyx Mori L.**

**Recommendation:**

- Accept as it is .....
- Accept after minor revision**.....
- Accept after major revision
- Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

**Reviewer's Comment for Publication.**

**1. General Comments**

This manuscript investigates the effect of *Ocimum sanctum* (Tulsi) leaf extract on the growth, cocoon production, and silk quality of *Bombyx mori*. The topic is relevant to sericulture, sustainable agriculture, and eco-friendly feed supplementation. The study shows positive effects of plant extract supplementation, particularly at 3% concentration, on several economic traits of silkworms. However, despite the relevance of the topic, the manuscript suffers from minor issues in language, clarity, experimental design, and scientific presentation. Substantial revision is required before it can be considered for publication.

**2. Content and Originality**

**Strengths:**

- Focuses on eco-friendly, plant-based supplementation, which is important for sustainable sericulture.
- Evaluates multiple economic traits (larval growth, cocoon weight, filament length, denier).
- Provides comparative analysis across different concentrations (1%, 2%, 3%).

**Limitations:**

- The use of *Ocimum sanctum* in silkworm feeding is not novel; similar studies already exist.
- The manuscript lacks a clear statement of novelty or research gap.
- Results are largely confirmatory rather than innovative.

**Conclusion:**

- Originality: Low to moderate
- Needs stronger justification of what new knowledge this study adds.

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### 3. Technical Quality

#### Strengths:

- Basic experimental setup is appropriate (control vs treatments).
- Multiple biological and commercial parameters are measured.

#### Minor Concerns:

#### 1. Experimental Design Issues

- Sample size unclear:
  - "50 larval each groups" is ambiguous.
- Replication not clearly described:
  - Number of replicates missing.
- No information on:
  - Randomization
  - Experimental controls beyond basic control group

#### 2. Statistical Analysis Weak

- Only mean  $\pm$  SD reported.
- No:
  - ANOVA
  - p-values
  - significance testing between groups
- Statements like "significant increase" are not statistically supported.

#### 3. Methodological Errors

- Centrifugation at 300 rpm is too low (likely incorrect).
- Extraction method lacks:
  - Standardization
  - Yield calculation
- No phytochemical quantification.

#### 4. Data Interpretation

- Overinterpretation of results:
  - Claims of "highly effective" without statistical proof.
- Some contradictions:
  - Discussion mentions 1% best in one place, 3% best elsewhere.

#### 5. Missing Controls

- No mention of:
  - Solvent control
  - Environmental variability control

#### Conclusion:

- Technical quality is weak to moderate
- Requires minor improvements in experimental rigor and statistical validation

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### 4. Language and Presentation

This is the most critical weakness of the manuscript.

Minor Issues:

- Extensive grammatical errors:
  - Example: "more Asia people is depended on it"
- Incorrect scientific writing style:
  - Informal, fragmented sentences
- Poor terminology:
  - "variant type of concentration"
  - "highly effect in larval"
- Inconsistent capitalization and formatting
- Missing spaces and punctuation:
  - "sprayo.sanctum"
  - "qualityas compared"

**Abstract:**

- Poorly written and unclear
- Needs complete rewriting

**Tables and Figures:**

- Table formatting is poor
- Units and labels inconsistent
- Figure captions incomplete

**Conclusion:**

- Requires complete language editing by a professional or fluent academic writer

### 5. Structure and Organization

**Strengths:**

- Includes all minor sections:
  - Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion

**Issues:**

#### 1. Abstract

- Unclear, grammatically incorrect, and poorly structured

#### 2. Introduction

- Repetitive and poorly connected
- Lacks clear:
  - Research gap
  - Hypothesis

#### 3. Methods

- Disorganized and inconsistent
- Missing key details:
  - Replication
  - Experimental design clarity

#### 4. Results

- Mostly descriptive
- No statistical validation
- Table presentation unclear

#### 5. Discussion

- Too long and repetitive
- Excessive citations without critical analysis

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Weak linkage between results and discussion

### 6. Conclusion

- Contains grammatical errors
- Needs clearer implications and applications

### 6. References and Citations

#### Strengths:

- Includes relevant literature in sericulture and plant extracts

#### Issues:

- Inconsistent formatting:
  - APA/Harvard style not followed
- Duplicate references (e.g., Sujatha 2015 appears twice)
- Incomplete references:
  - Missing journal details, page numbers
- Improper citation style:
  - Mixed formats within text
- Some outdated or unclear references

#### Conclusion:

- Requires minor formatting and standardization

### 7. Overall Recommendation

The manuscript addresses a relevant applied research topic with potential importance for eco-friendly sericulture practices. However, the current version has serious shortcomings in:

- Language and readability
- Experimental design clarity
- Statistical validation
- Scientific writing quality

The study has potential but requires extensive revision.

### Final Decision

#### Minor to moderate Revision

The manuscript has strong potential for publication but requires significant revision in language, structure, and technical clarity before it can be accepted.