

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_113165
Title of the Manuscript:	Documentation of Honeybees flora and Blooming period in major Horticultural and Agricultural crops growing in dryland regions of Northern Karnataka
Type of the Article	

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The content of the manuscript is goof and important for the scientific community. But it should be revised once for writing and missing prepositions.</p> <p>If the title can be rephrased as 'An analysis of the Diversity of Honeybees flora and their Blooming period in major Horticultural and Agricultural crops growing in the dryland regions of Northern Karnataka' it would be more appropriate. The abstract should be revised because there is no link between sentences.</p> <p>In Methodology section, just one subsection' Identification of bee-flora' is given. More subsections of the work done can be added. If details on the study area can be given in the form of a table it might look better. Same goes for 'results and discussion' part. Elaborate discussion using proper references should be given.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically okay but detailed work must be added.</p> <p>References are not sufficient. More recent references to justify the discussions should be added.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English should be revised thoroughly in the manuscript. Prepositions are missing in many places.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript needs to be revised thoroughly.</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)
<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:

Name:	Aparajita Chakraborty
Department, University & Country	St. Xavier's College (Autonomous) Kolkata, India