

Review Form2

Book Name:	Innovations in Biological Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2013
Title of the Manuscript:	A Study on Coevolutionary Relationship of Four Plants With Their Butterfly Pollinators on Basis of Their Nectar Physiology
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript on the coevolutionary relationship between four plants and their butterfly pollinators, based on nectar physiology, is of significant importance to the scientific community. It enhances our understanding of the intricate mutualistic interactions between plants and pollinators, shedding light on how specific physiological traits of nectar influence pollinator behavior and evolution. Such insights are crucial for biodiversity conservation, as they help predict how changes in plant traits or pollinator populations might affect ecosystem stability. I appreciate this manuscript for its potential to bridge gaps in knowledge about plant-pollinator dynamics and its relevance to conservation efforts. However, its complexity might pose challenges for those less familiar with the topic, necessitating a clear and accessible presentation of findings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The book chapter title is found on Google Scholar twice. Please change it. - Guddeti, M. (2014). A study on coevolutionary relationship of four plants with their butterfly pollinators on basis of their nectar physiology. <i>Environment and Natural Resources Research</i>, 4(2), 65. - MeerabaiGuddeti, M. G. (2014). A study on coevolutionary relationship of four plants with their butterfly pollinators on basis of their nectar physiology.	
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 writing is unclear and short. Please use more words to explain it better.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript structure is very brief, so let’s add more details to make it longer.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Correct any grammar issues in the manuscript.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	The references are very old, but recent ones are used.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	Add one table related to your topic and picture in book chapter and remove the heading of material method and result and discussion.	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tasawar Iqbal
Department, University & Country	Institute of Physiology and Pharmacology, University of Agriculture, Pakistan