

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_116799
Title of the Manuscript:	PERFORMANCE OF ARTIFICIALLY AND NATURALLY INSEMINATED HONEY BEE QUEENS (APIS CERANA INDICA)
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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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>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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Artificial insemination is an important tool to control and improve the genetic characteristics of honey bee species, and to maintain and improve local breeds. Bee breeder can use the AI tool to improve honey bee breeds, and in commercial projects as well. The title is appropriate for the manuscript. The title is appropriate for the manuscript. The summary is good. The subsections and structure of the manuscript are good. The manuscript is scientifically correct. I suggest using more modern references because the researcher used references dating back to the 1980s, and this is scientifically unacceptable. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Not too bad	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The time period for conducting the research is old, we are now in 2024.</p> <p>The manuscript contains many spelling errors that need to be corrected.</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:	Rawaa H. Tlay
Department, University & Country	Damascus University, Syria