

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Ophthalmology Research: An International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_OR_92898
Title of the Manuscript:	Bird Migration with Visual Avian Navigation: The PnP Linear Geometries-based Geo-referencing Functionality
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:

<https://www.journalor.com/index.php/OR/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>No need to abbreviate in title: PnP should be defined. Authors personalised the research throughout the report. Avoid the use of personal pronoun. Authors should limit the keywords to five. The authors self-plagiarised the introduction in abstract. Abstract should be a summary of the work done. Many areas that requires citation; including the figures. Figure 4: The two figures should have sub-number ((a) and (b)) and should be properly discussed Section 3 discussion does not give proper understanding to the subject matter. There should be more detailed explanation Discussion on PnP has only one citation. Discussion needs to be more detailed as this is the focus of this study. The background discussion is too shallow without adequate literature. No proper review of related works. What is the description of the Flickr and eBird datasets? How is it related to the area under consideration. Results are presented at results sections. Section 4.2 mentioned filters: What filter? why should you apply filter? Authors needs to provide sufficient justification for the outlined parameters in section 4.2. The dataset collection is not quite comprehensive and difficult to follow. What does the author mean by species name? There are inconsistent citation styles No clear relationship between the introduction and other sections It is not clear what kind of data was extracted and used as input for this study. The methodology is not clear. "Finally, we were able to obtain the unique number of Flickr bird nests locations and flying/travelling routes observed in our study area. However, it is important to note that certain observations were filtered out due to a mismatch in the species name, and in order to provide a list of all observations, a better approach is to train a convolutional neural network (CNN) model (or to use a pre-trained CNN) to extract the species name from the images and then to perform text matching [Lottian, M., Ingensand, J., and Brovelli, M. A. , 2020]." Authors stated that they were using pre-trained model, yet the adopted learning model was not mentioned. How were the images used with chi-square test? This report is not comprehensive</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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:	Martins E. Irhebhude
Department, University & Country	Nigerian Defence Academy, Nigeria