

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JABB_129728 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Nectar reoccurrence may increase visitation rates of <i>Tetragonula iridipennis</i> , in crop <i>Cucumis sativus</i> |
| Type of the Article | |

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part. | This manuscript provides valuable insights into the dynamic nature of nectar replenishment in plant-pollinator interactions, specifically focusing on <i>Cucumis sativus</i> and the Indian stingless bee, <i>Tetragonula iridipennis</i> . The study highlights an adaptive mechanism in nectar dynamics that sustains pollinator visits and enhances crop pollination, contributing to improved agricultural productivity. Its findings have significant implications for pollinator conservation, greenhouse crop management, and the understanding of plant reproductive strategies. This work bridges critical gaps in nectar ecology and can guide future studies on pollination biology and agricultural practices. | |
| Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) | The title is informative, but it can be improved for clarity and impact. Suggested title: "Nectar Replenishment Dynamics and its Influence on Pollination by <i>Tetragonula iridipennis</i> Smith in Greenhouse-Grown <i>Cucumis sativus</i> L." | |
| 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. | The abstract provides a general overview, but it can be further streamlined for clarity and focus. I suggest removing repetitive mentions of nectar as a pollinator attractant and including specific findings, such as the observed time-based patterns in nectar replenishment and their implications for pollinator visitation. Adding a concluding sentence about the broader ecological or agricultural relevance would improve its comprehensiveness. | |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a well-designed experiment and appropriate statistical analyses (e.g., MANOVA). The methods are detailed and replicable. However, some points in the discussion section could benefit from further elaboration on how the findings align with or differ from previous studies. | |
| Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. | The references are relevant and mostly recent. They may can add references in discussion section that may add readability and add clarity. | |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript's language is generally clear but could benefit from minor grammatical and stylistic improvements. Some sentences in the introduction and results sections are lengthy and could be rephrased for readability. Consistent formatting of species names and better organization of paragraphs would further enhance the manuscript's scholarly presentation. | |
| Optional/General comments | The authors took so much efforts to do this experiments but there are some grammatical mistakes like- Adding the authority after Scientific/Botanical names, some punctuation and grammar errors. Those things will add some clarity, reachability and value of this article to readers and to this journal. | |

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? | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Name: | Praveenkumar C |
| Department, University & Country | TNAU, India |