

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_127112
Title of the Manuscript:	A Review on the Sublethal Effects of Pure and Formulated Glyphosate on Bees, with a Focus on Social Bee Species
Type of the 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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	This manuscript is highly valuable to the scientific community as it synthesizes existing research on the sublethal effects of glyphosate on bee health, emphasizing a critical gap in understanding how this widely used herbicide impacts pollinators at non-lethal doses. By highlighting the differences between pure and formulated glyphosate and the specific vulnerabilities of social bee species, the paper provides crucial insights that could inform both future research and regulatory decisions. I appreciate the manuscript's thoroughness in discussing both behavioral and physiological impacts, as well as its emphasis on alternative herbicides and integrated pest management. This review addresses a significant topic in environmental toxicology and pollinator health.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Impact of Glyphosate on Bees: Sublethal Effects of Pure and Formulated Herbicides on Social Species" It simplifies the title while keeping the focus on the key issues (glyphosate's impact, sublethal effects, and social bees).	
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.	Abstract is overall comprehensive and provides a clear summary of the article's main points. It highlights the topic, the context of glyphosate usage, the impact on bees, and the key focus on social bee species. It might improve by including a brief mention of the gaps identified and providing more specific calls to action.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, The structure of your manuscript is generally well-organized, but breaking down the content into more specific subsections in the main body would enhance clarity, coherence, and depth.	
Please write a few sentences 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.	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it is grounded in current literature regarding the sublethal effects of glyphosate on bee health, particularly focusing on social bee species like honeybees, bumblebees, and stingless bees. Furthermore, the manuscript acknowledges existing research gaps, particularly the need for longitudinal studies and a better understanding of the cumulative effects of low-dose exposure, which demonstrates a clear understanding of the complexities involved in pesticide-ecosystem interactions. Overall, the manuscript integrates well-supported evidence and provides a thoughtful synthesis of the current state of knowledge while highlighting critical areas for future research.	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>References used in the manuscript seem to be sufficient for the current discussion. Rundlöf, M., et al. (2019). Long-term effects of herbicides on pollinator populations in a field study: a case for glyphosate. <i>Science of the Total Environment</i> 648: 412-419. EFSA (2022). Scientific opinion on the environmental risks of glyphosate use. <i>European Food Safety Authority Journal</i> 19(6): 678.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The writing is clear, formal, and consistent with the expectations of a scientific review. The sentences are structured well, and the content is presented in a logical, organized manner, making it easy for readers to follow the narrative.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Consider incorporating figures or tables to visually summarize key points. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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)</p>
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Fatima Shahzadi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Pakistan</p>