

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_119871
Title of the Manuscript:	COLLECTION OF FRESH POLLEN UNDER DIFFERENT POLLEN TRAPPING FREQUENCIES BY <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. COLONIES IN MUSTARD
Type of the Article	Original Research 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The manuscript is of importance in the scientific community specifically for apiculture as it provides practical insights on the productivity of bee colonies in a given treatment.</p> <p>2. The title is suitable enough. However, if I may suggest the authors an alternative title: "COLLECTION EFFICIENCY OF FRESH POLLEN UNDER DIFFERENT POLLEN TRAPPING FREQUENCIES BY <i>Apis mellifera</i> L. COLONIES IN MUSTARD".</p> <p>3. The abstract is concise, well-constructed and comprehensive enough.</p> <p>4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript was outstandingly discussed and are well laid out all throughout the manuscript content</p> <p>5. The manuscript presented scientifically sound results and of statistical merit.</p> <p>6. References cited were robustly sufficient and recent enough given the context of the study.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The authors had made an outstanding scholarly communication and mastery of the English language suitable enough for the article presented.	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bryan Glomel S. Silverio
Department, University & Country	University of the Philippines, Philippines