

Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal Name: | Journal of Agriculture and Ecology Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_JAERI_94882 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Common faunal diversity on forest floor of Bonai Forest Division, Odisha, India and their importance in forest ecosystem |
| Type of the 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.journaljaeri.com/index.php/JAERI/editorial-policy>)

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 | <p>There is need to revisit almost all the sections of the report, namely; Abstract which is too shallow and lacking tangible facts like a summary of the findings, baseline data among others, Introduction that is observed to be lacking important information for introducing the study, the problems, aim, objective etc, Methodology which is silent on the materials, nothing is said about the study area in terms of size, climate, features available, site/location policies/legislations available etc; Results and Discussion not providing enough/adequate information for future use and references and the conclusions that has not been well summarised basing on the aim of the research and the findings.</p> <p>Proofreading of the whole document to correct the grammar, typos, tenses etc including rephrasing/reconstruction of some sentences as well as taking out repeated statements.</p> <p>Consider adding a section on the proposed way forward to the report to address some of the challenges and observations made during the study that have been mentioned in the report.</p> <p>The conclusion part needs to be reviewed and it should be consistent with what has been provided in the whole document. It is not supposed to be a copy and paste of what is in the Results and Discussion sections but rather a summary of the findings which is also supposed to be part of the Abstract.</p> <p>Consider including references for most of the critical/crucial facts presented in the whole report. (See comments in the document with track changes).</p> <p>Consider numbering the Sections and sub-sections like Introduction, Conclusion and Reference for easy referencing.</p> <p>Not all references on the list have been used in the document. Only 4 of the total 10 references as indicated in the report have been used in the document i.e. 4,5,8 and 10. In addition, one of the references in the document is not included in the list of references (Wilson 1987 in the Introduction section. In general, there is need to review most the references listed as they are lacking information years. Some of them cannot be considered as references</p> | |
| Minor REVISION comments | <p>Say something about the quality of the environment for some of the abiotic factors mentioned e.g. air, oxygen, pH, water, soil, temperature etc as a baseline data for the research area</p> <p>Consider re-allocating Figures/Table in the document closer to where they have been introduced in the report for easy referencing (e.g. Table 1 and Plate 1).</p> | |
| Optional/General comments | <p>Consider avoiding the use of words like "we", "I" "us" etc. in the whole document. In other words, avoid personalising issues in research papers.</p> <p>Consider reviewing the title of the study/research to read " Common faunal diversity on Forest Floor and their importance in Forest Ecosystem: Bonai Forest Division, Odisha, India"</p> <p>Consider inserting page numbers to the report for easy referencing. I have made a number of comments under the compulsory, few ones in minor revision as well as optional/general sections; I feel the manuscript could be under the major revision range as most of the facts presented need to be corrected/revised if considered to be making sense by the author. All in all, the manuscript needs to be repaired basing on the deficiencies, some of which have been mentioned in addition to the track changes provided in the attached document may be of help to the author. I found the report to be mean on information, not providing enough/adequate information for future use/references and yet its a use study. Its too short/brief.</p> <p>It is a good study that can help in the management of the environment in general which when well administered, can help the global problem of climate change which becoming to be a threat to the present and future generations. However, there is a need to provide more details to the study and this should include the problems/challenges as well as the proposed way forward based on the experience generated from the study and other studies done in the region and beyond. No mention is made of the existing policy/policies/legislations in the country for up scaling the initiative.</p> | |

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? | <i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Name: | James Peaches Phiri |
| Department, University & Country | Malawi |