

## 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	Original Research 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)
<b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	<p>The idea and topic are interesting. The title is appropriate for the study. The whole manuscript is written in a way to be technical. The paper is scientifically sound.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>yes, it is</li> <li>yes, the title is suitable</li> <li>yes, the abstract is comprehensive</li> <li>yes, subsections and structure are appropriate</li> <li>yes, i think that</li> <li>the references sufficient, but all references should follow the following style</li> </ol> <p>1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p>	
<b>Minor REVISION</b> comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, it is good	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correct the spelling of the words in the manuscript.</li> <li>There are only some modest errors which could be easily corrected and would greatly improve the manuscript</li> <li>Change references style like the submission guidelines. All references should follow the following style</li> </ol> <p>1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p>	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ghada M. Samaha</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Research Centre, Egypt</b>