

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_84474
Title of the Manuscript:	Tapioca (Manihot esculenta Crantz.) and Borkesseru (Ailanthus excelsa Roxb.): The Potential Secondary Host Plants of Eri Silkworm and Their Diversified Uses
Type of the Article	Minireview 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.journalijpss.com/index.php/IJPSS/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	<p>The authors introduced the economic value of two shrubs, tapioca and borkesseru, so that people would better understand them. This review might provide some meaningful information for people to further protect and utilize these two shrubs, not only as host plants of eri silkworm. However, as a review manuscript, the following issues should be addressed before the final acceptance for publication.</p> <p>1. The biggest problem is that some descriptions are very superficial, and many sentences are more like personal experiences and subjective judgments, lacking sufficient literature support. For example, In 2.1 Diversified uses of tapioca. “Several researches also prove that the larval period become shorter as the silkworms feed on tapioca leaves along with higher shell ratio, shell weight, single cocoon weight, fecundity are obtained. Moreover, the incidence of diseases also becomes lower as compared to other host plants of eri silkworm.” “Also, it has been observed that the eri farmers of north-eastern region of India mainly perform rearing by using leaves of castor collected usually from road side or forest areas.” Here and there in the whole text, these kinds of statements lack key references and are clearly inappropriate.</p> <p>2. Some parts are not detailed, such as 2.1.2 Animal feed; 2.1.3 Pesticide; 2.1.5 Industrial use; 3.1.5 Use as Fuel. Also, the authors need to cite references for detailed descriptions.</p> <p>3. For a better understanding of the full text, I suggest that the author draw a schematic diagram or provide a table showing the characteristics and diversified uses of both plants.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>1. The key words are too many. The key words are not appropriate</p> <p>2. Some keywords are not very appropriate, and authors should use keywords that can summarize the central idea of the review or those which can reflect the object of the review.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>In order to make the manuscript more vivid and also help more readers to have an intuitive impression of these two plants, I suggest some pictures of these two plants be included in this manuscript.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Shiping Liu
Department, University & Country	Southwest University, China