

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_120283
Title of the Manuscript:	Occasional occurrences of Quelea birds in cultivating crops during the Belg season in Raya-azebo district of Tigray, Ethiopia
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Reviewer comments:</p> <p>The manuscript mainly highlights the impact of Quelea birds on crops grown during the Belg season in Ethiopia's Raya-Azebo district and many factors, viz., locality, planting time, harvesting time, crop types, presence of water source, and tree cover were identified as factors affecting bird damage. Overall, the study highlights the importance of understanding bird behavior and implementing appropriate cultural management practices to minimize crop losses caused by Quelea birds.</p> <p>The results are interesting. But unfortunately, the manuscript has several shortcomings and I advise the paper can be accepted after major revision.</p> <p>Suggestions and areas to address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title of the manuscript may be modified highlighting the objectives and findings of the study. 2. The English writing style must be revised in depth to make the article more comprehensible. The grammatical errors, punctuation, etc. need to be taken care of. 3. The scientific name of the test organism <i>i.e.</i>, Quelea bird should be mentioned at the point of their first mention in the manuscript. 4. To make the article more comprehensible to the global audience, Ethiopia region-specific words like 'woreda', 'kebele' should be properly described (preferably within bracket) at their first mention in the manuscript, if not avoided. 5. Period of the study should be mentioned in terms of months and not only as Belg season. 6. Coordinates of the location of the study is not in proper format. 7. Abbreviation "m.a.s.l" better be replaced by "m MSL" or written in full. 8. Names of the month should start in capital case throughout the text. 9. Whether the study was only on Quelea birds or all migratory birds infesting crops in general? If only on Quelea birds, then from the methodology section onwards due correction may be incorporated to mention Quelea birds in particular. 10. In Table 1, how are the degrees of freedom between groups in cases of "coverage of tree (bush)" and "Harvesting time" are 2 and 4, respectively? According to the later part of the manuscript, 2 types of forest cover and 4 harvesting times were assessed. In such case df between groups seems to be wrong and needs to be revised. 11. The in-text citations: Cheke et al. (2019) and Cheke and Sidatt (2019) needs to be properly discussed to support the findings of the present study, rather than drawing generalized statements from them. 12. In Table 2, Max. and Min. values seem to be interchanged. 13. In Table 3, harvesting time should be chronologically arranged. 14. After Table 3, the title of the section and Table 4 be better changed to "Effect of crop type on Quelea birds incidence." 15. In Table 4, "Standard division" should be corrected to "Standard deviation." 16. In the section "Effect of source of water and forest coverage on Quelea bird", what are the criteria for ascertaining the presence or absence of water 	

Review Form 3

	source and medium and low forest covers? These may be properly mentioned or any relevant reference may be cited. 17. The section “ Traditional control methods ” and Figure 3 are irrelevant to the present study and may be omitted. 18. The “ Conclusion ” section should be more precise mainly focusing on the findings of the present study only.	
--	---	--

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>	No

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Subrata Goswami
Department, University & Country	Banaras Hindu University, India