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

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study holds broad relevance as it explores the termite resistance of engineered wood products—materials that are gaining significant attention across various industries. The researchers conducted a series of studies to establish the optimal parameters for their new laboratory method, including selecting control wood species more attractive to termites, determining the optimal population density for both species, and optimising the duration of the test. They used a non-destructive X-ray analysis technique to quantify the damage caused by termites, obtaining more accurate results than traditional visual assessment methods. Finally, they developed a detailed protocol for laboratory testing of plywood and honeycomb against *H. indicola* and *C. heimi*, which can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of preservative treatments against these pests. However, I consider that the work must be substantially improved before a subsequent publication.	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	Yes, but I suggest to insert which techniques was used for the analysis. (X Ray)	
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 abstract mentions the development of a laboratory method for testing the resistance of plywood and blockboard to termite attack. It would be useful to specify the innovative aspect of this method compared to existing methods. Moreover, some important results should be described within the abstract.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Tables of results and images, at least the most relevant ones, should be placed within the text. The section on materials and methods is confusing. Sub-chapters on the different procedures (termite selection, wood samples, etc.) would be useful. Some tables could help in following the procedure.	
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 work is of significant scientific importance, although the manuscript is confusingly structured. Greater clarity and fluidity in the description of materials and methods is needed. Comparison of the results obtained with the main methods in the bibliography is also necessary. A greater description of the results obtained is also desirable. Moreover, Tables 1 and 2 present the data in a somewhat confusing manner. It would be useful to reorganise them to make them clearer and easier to interpret. For example, a colour code could be used to highlight the different levels of termite attack.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The bibliography could be expanded, especially in the part discussing the results. Including justifications as to why this method leads to better results. Most importantly, references already included, such as in the introduction, should be described at least a little.	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	The English has to be improved.	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the paper presents a potentially significant contribution in the field of wood protection from termite damage, offering an innovative and reliable laboratory method. By implementing the improvement suggestions discussed, the paper could gain in clarity, completeness and scientific impact.	

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Emanuele Cesprini**
Department, University & Country	**University of Padua, Italy**