

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_122895</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Report Of Tetragonula iridipennis Pollination On Flowering Plant Bryophyllum pinnatum In New Delhi, India</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Research article</b>

**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>
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.	This article is poorly and hurriedly written with the sole intention of publication in a journal. It is scientifically inappropriate because: 1. Some sections are poorly written such as study area, scientific classification of <i>T. iridipennis</i> and methods section. 2. Very few references have been used of which 37% of it is from a single author who has published all the 5-6 papers in the same year. 3. Certain sections in the article are not cited. 4. In the title, authority should be used for scientific names which is lacking in the paper. This indicates the author's knowledge about research and publication aspects.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Pollination of <i>Bryophyllum pinnatum</i> by <i>Tetragonula iridipennis</i> in New Delhi, India	
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.	Details on study area and methods can be included.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Study area section is missing.	
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.	Article is not scientifically robust because: 1. There is no clarity on the visits of the <i>T. iridipennis</i> before the collection for laboratory study. 2. What criteria was applied to select 10 plants randomly in the plot? 3. Literature on <i>T. iridipennis</i> not appropriately mentioned in the article. 4. Poor citations. 5. Scientific classification and authorities missing.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	1. Roopa, A. N., Eswarappa, G., Sajjanar, S. M., & Gowda, G. (2015). Study on nesting characteristics and biology of Stingless Bee ( <i>Trigona iridipennis</i> Smith.). IOSR-Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science, 8 (10): 34–36. 2. Sheetal, V. K., & Basavarajappa, S. (2009). Spatial distribution of stingless bee, <i>Trigona iridipennis</i> Smith in Manasagangotri, Mysore, Karnataka. Hexapoda, 16(2), 136-140.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language is good.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>Deepthi Narasimhaiah</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bangalore University, India</b>