

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_96180
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF TWO PLANT-BASED MATERIALS AS ALTERNATIVE ATTRACTANT OF HONEYBEES (APIS MELLIFERA ADANSONII) FOR PRODUCTION OF HONEY AND OTHER HIVE PRODUCTS IN AWKA
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:

<https://www.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes I suggest a slight change (I wrote the details in ms) Yes Yes Manuscript needs revisions and additions. Yes	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Dear Authors and Editors, I have carefully read your MS submitted for consideration in the Asian Journal of Biology. This manuscript is generally well-written, logically structured, and easy to understand. It also addresses a subject of great interest in the scientific community. The work's title in the current version needs minor correction. The abstract and the introduction chapter are well-written and provide an excellent background to the research. I recommend a minor revision of this article in its current version. I used the proofreading tool. Some minor adjustments were made directly to the text. Other suggested adjustments are in the comments throughout the text. These suggestions are in the file attached to this opinion.	

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)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anna Jakubska Busse
Department, University & Country	University of Wroclaw, Poland