

Journal Name:	Journal of Basic and Applied Research international
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOBARI_12532
Title of the Manuscript:	The Comparison and Application of 3D-Modeled Sutures in the Ironclad Beetle Phloeodes diabolicus for Use in Load-Bearing Construction
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 <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.	Manuscript talks about the fundamental studies of structures in relation with beetle. Further a fundament experimental study has been conducted to see the strength of structure of which design in motivated from insects.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is Acceptable	
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.	<p>Abstract is not fully professional. Minor changes are required. Incorporate folling points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fundamental comparision have been conducted between layes of structure. 2. Remove the contradiction points like, “this study nonetheless facilitated a further understanding of the detailed mechanics of ironclad beetles” into, “This study facilitates the fundamental understanding of...” 3. Start of the abstract should provide the scope of project/study rather than talking about the motivation first. (take the end section first and then motivation and at last 4 statements on results/findings) 	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Following part to be rectified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subsection “Materials and settings ” to be converted into “Materials and Manufacturing tecnique” 2. Addition of error anlysis will be beneficial (not compulsory) 3. Results and Plots does not shows the error marings reflects lack of professional research ethics. 	
Please write a few sentences	Manuscript provides fundamental tudy of strength of structure which	

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.	is motivated from insects in environments. Study is fundamental but useful in scientific community as they provide platform for advanced research and experimnts. Techincally limitations and assumnsions should be disscused in brief which is presented in limited manner. This reduced the reliability of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Kindly note additional refrences provides strength to the claims but limited refrences does the job. However additional literatue review of around 1000 words atleast provides strength to the manuscript	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Its acceptable for young researchers.	
Optional/General 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:	Suraj Prashad Sharma
Department, University & Country	Brunel University Of London, UK