

Journal Name:	BIONATURE
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BN_1769
Title of the Manuscript:	LABORATORY TESTING METHODOLOGY FOR PANEL PRODUCTS AGAINST TERMITE RESISTANCE
Type of the 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>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer’s comment	Author’s Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript will contribute positively to the body of knowledge in the scientific world. It has so many benefits to human kind. The control of termite infestation will help with long lasting wood materials which are beneficial to man	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	The article is not comprehensive. It needs some adjustment which I stated clearly in the manuscript.	Little adjustment done
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	To an extent. Some part of the methodology was in the introduction but I made the necessary corrections.	Revised
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study is adding to the body of knowledge. This makes it scientifically robust and technically sound. Finding a lasting solution to the infestation of termites is a great impact to the scientific world.	Ok
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient but not well arranged. The author can do better with the arrangement. Most recent reference is preferable.	Revised
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		Ok
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a great work. It needs to be well arranged.	A good scientific research.

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>	