



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_51527
Title of the Manuscript:	Harnessing Potentials and Optimization of Apicultural education as pathway for alleviating poverty in Southern Nigeria
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The introduction directs the reader to the object of study of the paper. Presents some outdated references. And this section (1.1) is very long.</p> <p>Line 36-38 This phrase is very confusing, as: The bee's mouthpiece is of the licking type which has a structure called the glossa with which it extracts the floral nectar. And in the corbicula collects the pollen grains. The Authors need to review the sentence.</p> <p>Line 39-40 What's the genus? Is it <i>Apis</i>?</p> <p>Line 76-80 Review the information seems repeated.</p> <p>Line 218-219 What software is used for statistical analysis of data?</p> <p>Results Table 2 - What do abbreviations mean?</p> <p>Please check the citations from the tables and reference by the corresponding number (Table 1, Table 2.....).</p> <p>The discussion of the data is superficial.</p> <p>Remake the conclusion more objectively and clearly, as this is the answer of the objective of this study.</p> <p>Line 423-435 These sentences are not conclusion. It is an unnecessary explanation of the objective and methodology as they have already been presented in the previous sections.</p> <p>Check the references and consider performing the search and citations in indexed scientific journal</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andreia Santos do Nascimento
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal do Recôncavo da Bahia, Brazil