

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 (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 paper describes the using a non-destructive and quantitative approach of X-Ray analysis for the development of a testing system for plywood and blockboard against termite resistance. It is an interesting case study. However, there are several issues should be considered.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Yes	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Table 1 needs to be presented more clearly and scientifically to help readers follow it easily. In addition, it should be specified, how many samples the data obtained in Tables 1 and 2 are the average, and add the standard deviation.- Rearrange the order of the figures (for example, "Schematic diagram of assembly of the rearing matrix used for test" is mentioned first but it is set to Image 5).- Page 5, 2nd paragraph from the bottom, the author mentioned Fig. 1. Is it Image 1?- Image 1. it should be specified, after how many days exposure with termite?- RESULT AND DISCUSSION: The authors should discuss further to see that the proposed testing method is feasible and reliable. Yes, the English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are still many grammatical errors. Authors should focus on revising the entire manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors should consider and revise according to the above comments.	

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:	Nguyen Thi Thanh Hien
Department, University & Country	Viet Nam National University of Forestry, Viet nam