

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Plant & Soil Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPSS_128234
Title of the Manuscript:	Bee Forage Tree Resources for Wild Honeybees: A Case Study from Kodagu's Sacred Groves and Coffee Agroecosystems
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses critical aspects of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management, particularly the role of sacred groves and their cultural significance. It provides valuable insights into integrating traditional ecological knowledge with modern conservation strategies, which is crucial for maintaining biodiversity in the face of anthropogenic pressures. The findings have implications for policy-making and sustainable management practices, making this study highly relevant for the scientific community.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title " Bee Forage Tree Resources for Wild Honeybees: A Case Study from Kodagu's Sacred Groves and Coffee Agroecosystems" is appropriate and effectively conveys the essence of the manuscript	Yes
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 comprehensively outlines the study's objectives, methodology, and key findings. However, it could benefit from emphasizing the unique contributions of the research, such as the integration of traditional ecological knowledge with modern conservation practices and the identification of key species unique to sacred groves. Including a brief mention of practical applications, such as how this study could guide community-based conservation programs, would further enhance its impact. But there is a shortage of keywords may be addition of some keywords will be useful to find the article in search engines and also it will reach.	Noted and effected
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically robust and well-structured. The methodologies are clearly described, and the results are supported by relevant data. However, providing more detail about statistical analyses used to interpret biodiversity indices or comparisons across sacred groves and non-sacred areas would strengthen the overall scientific rigor. Regarding in the materials and methods and in results paper author indicated so many trees and their data collection, if they could have <b>added some illustrations/ pictures/ Graphs in discussion</b> will be realistic and be in more scientific manner.	Noted
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are crosschecked and as of me it is correct but one suggestion from me is, in introduction section lack of recent references, so many are older and very few recent ones are there if possible they might add and it would appreciable.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is suitable for scholarly communication. Minor revisions, such as simplifying complex sentences in the discussion section and ensuring consistent use of technical terms, could further enhance clarity and readability. For example, in table 5 in writing the botanical name as <i>Acronychia pedunculata</i> , the author had written or typo error as “ <i>Acronychia pendunculata</i> ”; and also in Table 6: inconsistent capitalization is there for writing the family name <i>Verbenaceae</i> appears as "verbenaceae" and in few places author gave Capitalize each word for headings that one needs to be checked; some many punctuation errors (Table1..) and grammatical mistakes also be there that needs to be corrected for better readability.	Revision made
Optional/General comments	Working on the grammatical, punctuation errors and reducing the usage of complex sentences in the discussion section and adding more recent references will increase the paper reach.	Noted

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	