

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>	<p>This manuscript under review addresses relevant topics in honey bee research and apiculture that could have practical implications for sustainable agriculture, conservation, and industry. Hence, the topic addressed is relevant and important to the scientific community.</p> <p>The title appears suitable for a scientific manuscript, in terms of clarity, specificity, relevance, and conciseness. It effectively communicates the key components of the study, making it potentially valuable for the scientific community interested in honeybee research.</p> <p>The article appears to be comprehensive in summarizing the study's purpose, methods, and key findings. However, a brief explanation of the practical implications of the observed differences in the performance between AI and NI colonies could have been added like how these findings might impact selective breeding efforts or honey production practices.</p> <p>The article appears to follow a standard format for a research paper. However, the following points could have been incorporated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Addition of specific objective of the study 2. Ensure consistency in terminology. For example, there are variations in how <i>A. c. indica</i> is referenced (e.g., "<i>A. c. indica</i>," "<i>A. c. indicaindica</i>," "<i>A. c. indicaindica F.</i>"). 3. Uniformity in the citation format 4. Provide clear interpretations of the statistical results. Explain what the findings mean in the context of the research question (e.g., do AI colonies significantly differ from NI colonies in terms of productivity?). <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, however, uniformity in citations to be maintained.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>For further improvement of the article, you may consider the following points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check for grammatical errors 2. Clearly state the objective or research question in the introduction section 3. May add a description of the statistical methods used for analysis. 4. Avoid excessive details of results, rather present using figures or tables to summarize the data 5. In the discussion section, address limitations and potential sources of bias in the study. 6. Discuss more on the significance of finding in relation to the existing literature 7. Use consistent citation style 	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sruthi Nambiar
Department, University & Country	Narayana Health, India