

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Environment and Climate Change</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_124152
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>SUSTAINING POLLINATOR DIVERSITY: CONSERVATION, CHALLENGES, AND SOLUTIONS FOR ECOSYSTEM HEALTH</b>
Type of the Article	Review Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p><b>-Abstract:</b> #The abstract must highlight specific details on key findings or statistical results that would give the reader a clearer sense of the study's impact. #Ensure clarity in describing the proposed solutions for pollinator conservation. If any specific policy recommendations or practical interventions are discussed, they should be mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p><b>-Introduction:</b> #Should highlight the specific gaps in research that this study aims to fill in the last paragraph of the introduction. Are there regions, species, or ecological factors that have been overlooked in previous studies? #Consider a more detailed explanation of how pollinator decline directly affects ecosystem services and food security to underline the relevance of the study.</p> <p><b>-Materials and Methods:</b> Missing heading. #Include a justification for the selection of study sites and methods. This would strengthen the reproducibility and applicability of the research. #Are the assumptions for statistical tests valid, and were they tested?</p> <p><b>-Results:</b> Before explanation of Orders, need to have a heading i.e., Results. #Ensure that each result aligns with the study's objectives. #Consider including a subsection on "unexpected findings" or results that didn't align with predictions, offering potential explanations.</p> <p><b>-Discussions:</b> Some parts of the discussion may lack depth in terms of the interpretation of results. Does the discussion address the full scope of the study's limitations?</p> <p><b>-Conclusions:</b> The conclusions may be too general. It's important that they directly relate to the study's specific results, not just broader environmental trends.</p> <p><b>-References</b> need as per Journal format.</p> <p>*Cite these articles:            Madhu, N.R., Sarkar, B., Biswas, P., Patra, A., Biswas, S.J., &amp; Behera, B.K. (2015). Plant extracts as potential for Anti-feeding activity of rodents and some important insects pest: An eco-friendly approach for pest control. <i>Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci.</i> 2(8), 170–175.            * Madhu, N.R. (2019). Study on brinjal insect pests and its management at garden experiment. <i>Int. J. Adv. Res. Biol. Sci.</i>, 6(2), 256-259. (ISSN: 2348-8069).  <a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2019.06.02.027">http://dx.doi.org/10.22192/ijarbs.2019.06.02.027</a></p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>		
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>		
<p><b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>		

### Review Form 3

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>		
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

### **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>Nithar Ranjan Madhu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Acharya Prafulla Chandra College, India</b>