

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JABB_112928</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Bee Conservation: A Critical Analysis of Strategies and Impacts on Pollination</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 1.7**

**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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The results, especially the comparisons between the proposed algorithms, should be discussed more detailed. What are the insights? Why the proposed strategy/mechanism can achieve good results?</p> <p>2. Furthermore, briefly describe the major contributions in bullet form, just before the organization paragraph.</p> <p>3. Existing solutions of the topic along with the problems of the existing schemes/solutions</p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>The abstract is not coherent. It would be good if authors can write a sentence describing numerical results and improvement over other methods.</p> <p><b>No, There are no subsections and existing and proposed systems are not mentioned. Just like a text book notes.</b></p> <p><b>Theoretically it is correct, but Practical point of view some more additions are required.</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>1. Furthermore, briefly describe the major contributions in bullet form, just before the organization paragraph.</p> <p>2. Various figures are not explained well. I suggest adding a brief description of each figure in their captions.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Good</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. The literature review is flat and does not properly establish the need for the proposed work.</p> <p>2. The novelty and worth of this work need to be clearly reflected in the abstract. Furthermore, the abstract need to be condensated. The outcomes of the manuscript need also to be reflected in the abstract. The technology applied and the performance review of the proposed design is demonstrated in efficient way and authors are informed to justify with real time experimental analysis in the result and discussion section if required. This article contains material which significant information in the current area of research.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>M. Indrasena Reddy</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bvrith College of Engineering for Women, India</b>