

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130551
Title of the Manuscript:	Influence of weather parameters on pollen and nectar foraging activity of Apis and Non-Apis species of honey bees in wild and cultivated varieties of jamun (Syzygium cumuni L. skeels)
Type of the Article	

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 insights into the influence of weather parameters on the foraging activity of both Apis and non-Apis honeybee species in the wild and cultivated varieties of jamun (<i>Syzygium cumini</i>). Understanding these relationships is pivotal for enhancing pollination efficiency and fruit yield, especially given the increasing emphasis on sustainable agriculture. The research highlights the ecological interactions and behavioral patterns of key pollinators, contributing to biodiversity conservation efforts. Additionally, it offers valuable data on climate variables affecting pollinator activity, which is significant in the context of climate change. By focusing on an underexplored indigenous crop with medicinal importance, the study fills a crucial gap in agroecological research. The findings can aid in formulating strategies to optimize pollinator management in both natural and agricultural ecosystems.	The present study helps to know the pollen and nectar foraging behaviour of <i>Apis</i> and non- <i>Apis</i> bees in prevailing weather parameters. Out of studied pollen and nectar foragers, the relative humidity and wind speed affected the pollen and nectar foragers of <i>T. iridipennis</i> on wild and cultivated varieties of jamun.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title, "Influence of weather parameters on pollen and nectar foraging activity of Apis and Non-Apis species of honey bees in wild and cultivated varieties of jamun (<i>Syzygium cumuni</i> L. skeels)", accurately reflects the manuscript's focus. It is clear, specific, and adequately captures the study's core aspects, making it informative and appropriate for its intended audience.	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 effectively summarizes the key findings, including the peak activity periods for different species and the correlations between weather parameters and foraging behavior. However, it could benefit from a more concise presentation of the study's scope and implications to enhance readability and impact.	Necessary corrections were incorporated in manuscript
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with detailed observations and statistical analyses supporting its conclusions. The use of correlation studies to link weather parameters with pollinator behavior is appropriate, and the inclusion of multiple species adds depth to the analysis. However, further validation or broader datasets might strengthen the generalizability of the results.	The studied species were regular nectar and pollen foragers on the crop where others forage only nectar or pollen. Hence others species were not included.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are relevant for the study's context. To enrich the discussion, it is recommended to incorporate recent studies on pollinator behavior under varying climatic conditions, such as works addressing global warming's impact on pollination ecology or the resilience of specific pollinator species in changing environments.	The relevant works were cited in overall correlation part in discussion.

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language is generally suitable for scholarly communication, but minor grammatical and syntactical improvements are needed. Phrasing could be more concise in some sections, and technical terms should be consistently used to avoid ambiguity.	Necessary correction were incorporated in manuscript
Optional/General comments	<p>Additionally, here are suggestions that would lead to improvements in the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- recommendation to include a map showing the localities where the sampling was conducted. This would provide readers with a clear geographical context for the study, enhancing the understanding of its spatial scope and relevance;- in the methodology section, it would be beneficial to specify the software package used for data processing and the statistical methods employed to generate the results;- the methodology for obtaining data on weather conditions (such as the source of the weather data, instrumentation used, and the frequency of measurements) should be detailed further;- the discussion section could be improved and expanded to provide deeper insights into the implications of the results. Comparing the findings with other similar studies could contextualize the results. Furthermore, elaborating on the ecological and agricultural significance of the findings would enrich the narrative;- it is important to highlight the broader significance of the findings, both in the present context and for future research. For example, how these results contribute to biodiversity conservation and sustainable practices, or how the findings could influence pollination management strategies in diverse ecosystems.	<p>Map of experimental site was added</p> <p>Necessary corrections were incorporated for all the comments</p>

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)	No ethical issue were considered