

Editor's Comment:

The manuscript "Effect of endophytic bacteria *Burkholderia cepacia* on growth, cocoon characters and enzyme activity of silkworm, *Bombyx mori* L." makes a comparison between the presence of *B. cepacia* and enzymatic production in insects, according to time!

For this type of work, where comparisons are used, statistical analysis is essential !! should be done! added to this, other notes were relevant to the decision-making

Abstract

an abstract lets readers get the gist or essence of your paper, in order to decide whether to read the full paper; Your abstract should be intelligible on its own, without a reader's having to read your entire paper. And in an abstract, you usually do *not* cite references—most of your abstract will describe what *you* have studied in your research and what *you* have found and what *you* argue in your paper. In the body of your paper, you will cite the specific literature that informs your research; the typical kinds of information found in most abstracts: introduction/methods and results/ implications or significance of study;

introduction

extremely long, confusing and tedious reading introduction; what is the gap of the problem raised by the researchers? after all, what is the relevance of the study? must be rewritten; highlight most current references (2016-2020); scientific name must be spelled out only once in the text!

Materials and Method

the MS in general needs a good review of scientific writing; including dimensions of weight, measure, hours and degrees; presentation of formulas; scientific name (methodology); *Burkholderia cepacia* was inoculated to 250 ml conical flask containing LB broth. What is the relevance of this information? the most important thing is to know the size of the bottle or the volume of the medium? more information is lacking in the methodology; what is the origin of *Burkholderia cepacia* used in MS? is it *Burkholderia cepacia* complex (BCC) ??? better explain the origin of biological material; what is the manufacturer of the LB medium? how to rule out the possibility that the larvae are contaminated with *B. cepacia*?

Results and discussion

present the results in a more objective way; paragraphs are too long and there is little discussion; the references used are very old!

presenting results in graphs and tables is redundant; select the best way to present your results; if you choose a table, the results of amylase and protease can be grouped in the same table;

the figures (photos) are totally unnecessary !!

where is the conclusion of the work?

based on reading the manuscript, my decision is to **reject** it; the authors will be able to improve the MS and add statistical analysis and resubmit for further analysis.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Luciana Furlaneto-Maia

Lecturer, Department of Microbiology, Federal Technological University of Parana, Brazil