



Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3602
Title of the Manuscript:	The Role of Pollinators in Enhancing Biodiversity and Pollination Mechanisms- A review
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline:

This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty', provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
Compulsory REVISION comments		
<p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The challenges have significant impacts on biodiversity, as the decline in pollinator populations can lead to reduced plant reproduction, genetic bottlenecks, and the collapse of plant-pollinator networks</p>	
<p>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	



<p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Technical discussions on results are not given. 2. Related schemes are not discussed properly. 3. It is hard to identify the novelty of the proposed work 4. Discuss the limitations and future scope of this work. 	
<p><u>Optional</u> comments</p>		



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M.Indrasena Reddy
Department, University & Country	India