



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAERI_38347
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF FLORIVORY ON THE DONATION AND DEPOSITION OF POLLEN IN Ipomea imperatii
Type of the Article	Short 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 9: “It was found that there are significant differences for the variables measured between the treatment 75% and the rest of the treatments” I encourage the authors to write direct and complete/clear sentences e.g., It was found that there are significant differences in pollen donation and reception between flowers with 75% damage compared to the control and flowers with 25% damage. Please also consider changing similar sentences elsewhere in the MS. Line 18: change “Florivory is the process in which a predator consumes totally or partially flowers,” to “Florivory is the process in which a predator totally or partially consumes flowers,” Line 27: change “photosynthesis” to “photosynthate” Line 38: change “floral area” to “floral parts”. I suppose this should be corrected all through the MS Line 47: expand on the study site description. A brief idea about environmental conditions, vegetation type, etc. Line 50: change “in whose” to “among” or “amongst” Line 52: The description of ‘<i>Ipomea imperatii</i>’ is important but does not belong in material and methods!! And has to move perhaps to the intro? As species description? Line 69: change “To perform the damage on the flowers was used a hole maker whose damage resembles the natural damage” to “To perform the damage on the flowers, a hole maker was used to produce an effect that simulates natural damage” Line 71: change “The half flowers of each treatment” to ‘Half of the flowers of each treatment’ Line 76: change “At the same time, 10 flowers were chosen, which were pocketed to avoid the movement of’ to “An additional 10 flowers were chosen and pocketed (covered with pollination bags?) to avoid the movement of...”	Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 77: change “From this sample of flowers was calculated the average number of pollen grains offered by the flower.” To “This sample is used to calculate the average number of pollen grains offered by the flower.” Line 82: change “To compare pollen deposition data, the number of pollen grains per anther of the emasculated flowers per treatment” to “To compare pollen deposition data, the number of pollen grains per stigma of the emasculated flowers per treatment...”. Line 93: change “floral removal to 75% managed to donate 78.1% of the total of its pollen” to “floral removal to 75% managed to donate 78.1% of its pollen” Line 106: change “Traits such as flower color, size, number and type of reward all for pollen dissemination and receipt” to “Traits such as flower color, size, number and type of reward are important for pollen dissemination and reception” Line 109: start new sentence: This observation can have two connotations.. Line 110: Your statement that {it is possible that the plant may discriminate and limit the donation and deposition of pollen} These plants are insect-pollinated so how could this be possible in case of donation? What is the adaptive advantage to the plant limiting the transfer its pollen? In case of deposition does this mean even if insects delivered pollen to damaged flowers it won’t be accepted? It sounds like your first assertion is not supported Line119-120: simplify: e.g., Both natural and artificial florivory impose a negative cost to plant reproduction. Line 122: this is a hard evidence of the evolution pressure of the florivory on the plants? This needs an explanation. Do you mean plants are under selection press to limit/cope with herbivory? Is there any chance that pollen can be transferred/donated by wind especially in partially damaged flowers/exposed stigmas?	Done Done Done Done Done Done Done Done There is no evidence of wind pollination in this species
Optional/General comments		