

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_81661
Title of the Manuscript:	Effects of probiotic supplemented diet on growth performance of silkworm Bombyx mori and improved characteristics of cocoon and silk
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Page 1. Line 3 and 7. The characteristics are too broad so they should be specified.2. Page 1. Line 6 should read "...probiotic namely normagut on..."3. Page 1. Line 13 should read "...different concentrations: 1%,..."4. Page 1. Line 13 should read "...supplementation started from..."5. Page 1. Line 23 should read "Conclusion: The probiotics..." Other words must be omitted.6. Page 1. Line 27 should read "...mori is a monophagous..."7. Page 2. Line 1 should read "Silk production is also dependent..."8. Page 2, Line 9. Which parameters? Specify.9. Page 2. Line 12. "...vitamin carbohydrates amino acid vitamin.." must be corrected and punctuations namely comma should be used.10. Page 2. Line 20 should read "...commercial by analysing the growth..."11. Page 2. Line 23 should read "...mori was procured..."12. Page 2. Line 24 should read "...operation was carried..."13. Page 2. Line 30. References should be given for foliar spray method.14. Page 2. Line 35 should read "...groups including 1%, 2% and 3% normagut concentrations.15. Page 2. Line 36-37. The sentence "The clean.....prepared solution." Must be omitted because it is not necessary.16. Page 2. Line 41 should read "...was given up to one day." Or other expressions to make it much clearer.17. Page 3. Line 2 should read "...larvae were randomly..."18. Page 3. Line 9 should read "...and cocoon was measured..."19. Page 3. Line 28-30. The sentence "In the....recorded." must be omitted because it is not necessary.20. Page 4. Line 2 should read "...were analysed." Other words must be omitted.21. Page 4. Line 2-17. This must be rewritten. There is no need to explain the results by just repeating the table and telling only numbers. Tell reader about important trends or points from the results.22. Page 5. Line 2-13. This must be rewritten. There is no need to explain the results by just repeating the table and telling only numbers. Tell reader about important trends or points from the results.23. Page 6. Line 16 should read "...control group, similar to those by Masthan et al. who reported that..."24. Page 7. Line 2-3 should read "...bacteria play a major role..."	Respected Reviewer, Thank you very much for your critical comments on this manuscript. We have carefully revised the manuscript and corrected the text based on the reviewers comment. We have carefully read the queries 1 – 24 and modified the text accordingly. In addition to this typo errors were corrected. Statistical value was provided. All changes were highlighted as red font. Thank you.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 1.6

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>	