

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Experimental Agriculture International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_115027
Title of the Manuscript:	AVIFAUNAL DIVERSITY IN TELANGANA STATE: A CASE STUDY IN CAMPUS OF PROFESSOR JAYASHANKAR TELANGANA STATE AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY, RAJENDRANAGAR, HYDERABAD
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript important for scientific community because it have good information about the depredation birds. On the other hands the importance of bird for agricultural fields by the controlling the pests. 2. The title is suitable for me. 3. The content of abstract good but it has long sentence and also have two different idea, so it needs two sentence for understanding of the reader. The Keywords needs chronological ordering, and most of the time the keywords have single word or phrase so, please make it single word/phrase. The tittle words not keywords so it is important changing the tittle words. 4. The structure of the manuscript is appropriate, however, the subsection missed. The material and method needs sampling design section, for data collection and also needs data analysis method. 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct with minor correction mentioned above in general. 6. The references are not recent and not sufficient, especially in discussion part. Only three references are somewhat recent (published after 2000). <p>Note: please separate the result and discussion section independently. This may important for reader understanding.</p> <p>Please find the track change for further minor comments.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	I don't want to comment on this section, because English language is not my mother tongue.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript idea is interesting but need correction that I mentioned above.	

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:	Hailu Tilahun Argaw
Department, University & Country	Wolkite University, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia