

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_122940
Title of the Manuscript:	" Pollination Peril: Neonicotinoids' Impact on Indian Honey Bee Apis cerana Fab. (Hymenoptera;Apidae) Foraging in Sunflower"
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 examines the impact of neonicotinoids, specifically imidacloprid and thiamethoxam, on the foraging activity and colony performance of <i>Apis cerana</i> Fabricius (Hymenoptera: Apidae) when these bees forage on treated plants. Research like this is crucial not only for conserving pollinators but also for ensuring the sustainability of commercial beekeeping in the future.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of the article "Pollination Peril: Neonicotinoids' Impact on Indian Honey Bee <i>Apis cerana</i> Fab. (Hymenoptera; Apidae) Foraging in Sunflower" is covers and focuses on the main idea of the study. However, to make it appealing and highlight the key results, we may suggest an alternative title : Pollination Peril: The Impact of Neonicotinoids on Foraging Behaviour of Indian Honey Bee, <i>Apis cerana</i> Fab. (Hymenoptera: Apidae) in Sunflower Fields	
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.	Overall, the abstract of the article provides a concise overview; however, refining the presentation of key results and recommendations could enhance its impact and clarity.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Based on the sections presented, the content of the article appears to be technically sound.	
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.	Overall, the manuscript is well-structured and properly organized.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided in the article are relevant and sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The article is well-written, using appropriate technical language for scholarly communication, and is suitable for publication.	
Optional/General comments	NA	

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ramanuj Vishwakarma
Department, University & Country	Bihar Agricultural University, India