



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Applied Science & Technology</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJAST_5353
Title of the Manuscript:	POLLENS OF MELLIFEROUS PLANTS OF ECOLOGIC ZONES IV AND V OF TOGO
Type of the Article	Research papers

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Abstract: - it is not highlighted the objective of the work; - the period of the study (the samples of honey where harvested from to ...). - Introduction - Lack: period of the study (pollens collections and analysis). It could enrich the paper some economic data concerning the production (& trade) of honey of Togo. 100 - it could enrich the paper to explain the Erdtman method. 116-121 - 'Generally it has been admitted ...', lack of references. 119 - obtain not abtain 3.1.1 - See the comment about Table 1. It could improve the paper to put in this paragraph only description and comments concerning main data of the table. 198 - results (lack of 'I') Table 1: I suggest an Appendix; it is too long. Add	Abstract: - I think that I have tried to show in lines 12; 13 and 14 where the samples of honey studied have been harvested. - I have tried to take the others remarks into account. Introduction - I have put the period where the study and the harvest of honey have been carried out. Line 100:I have preferred to keep it like that Ok Ok I remove the comments done in 3.1 and put it in 3.1.1. I think that this could improve the paper. Ok I have added the source; but about the length of



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Source. Photos: I suggest an Appendix; they are too much to stay in the text of the paper. Add Source Figures – Add Source.	Table 1 I think that it could not be interesting to cut it in small Tables. I have added the source I have added the source
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is essentially descriptive. It could be improved: methodology (more details) and discussion are a little' poor.	I have tried to complete their content. According to the discussion, I think that you are reason to say that because I have taken this manuscript of my scientific research on the inventory of melliferous plants which pollens are present in honey. Thank you for all of your contribution.