SCIENCEDOMAIN *international*
www.sciencedomain.org

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOB_43268**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Unacknowledged Potential Factors in Catastrophic Bee and Insect Die-off Arising from Coal Fly Ash Geoengineering**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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

SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**Honey bee is written in some places honey bee separately and in some places together as honeybee.** **Line 60-65, term we is used, these lines need revision.** **Line 182 – Orthoptera :Acrididae shouldn't be in italics** **Details are enclosed separately for clarity.** **Review Report** **Abstract –** It is well written briefly with good illustrations. **Introduction –** It is ok, the objectives of the study is well documented by providing necessary references. **Methods –** OK, but this part shows little deficiency about the experimental work on bee species in the present study**.** **Results and discussion –** Collected data is presented in only two figures. Figures title is very big and lacking proper illustrations. To the obtained data, author(s) have discussed the data with earlier reports published on different group of insects. Author(s) put lot of efforts to justify their objectives, set for the present study. Present results are compared with the earlier reports with good comprehension. **References** - Around 74 references are cited in this article and all the references are very much appropriately cited as and when required. However, before final print, better, author should check the format. Overall, it is a good piece of work; really appreciate the efforts put by the author(s). It can be considered for publication only after minor revision. **Following mistakes are to be corrected in the MS before final print.**	

Sl. No.	Appeared in the MS	To be corrected as
1.	Line 17 - Principle	Principal
2.	Line 17 – (Bombus)	(*Bombus* sp.)
3.	Line 37 – Here we propose	However, it is presumed
4.	Line 50 – we have previously shown by forensic methods	Reports are available to show
5.	Lines 60 to 65	Re-write as: During the present investigation, attempts were made to describe and provide evidence that aerosolized CFA yields toxic elements that contaminate the environment and become major contributors of insect die-offs. Moreover, discussions are made on toxins extractions from CFA into rainwater, effects of CFA particulate-components on insect viability. Further, the harmful consequences of enhanced UV-B and UV-C solar radiation that concomitantly arise from atmospheric ozone reduction by aerosolized CFA are discussed.
6.	Line 89 is not required	-
7.	Line 95 to be revised	-
8.	Line 155 - Drosophila	*Drosophila*
9.	Line 166 – Bumble pupae	Bumble bee pupae
10.	Line 168- Bumblebee	Bumble bee

SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	-	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	***S. Basavarajappa***
Department, University & Country	***University of Mysore, India***