



Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3343
Title of the Manuscript:	Avian Diversity of Nature Park, Kolkata (West Bengal, India)
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**General guideline:**

**This journal believes that no manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of 'lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. Too often a journal's decision to publish a paper is dominated by what the Editor/reviewer think is interesting and will gain greater readership - both of which are subjective judgments and lead to decisions which are frustrating and delay the publication. This journal will rigorously peer-review your submissions and publish all papers that are judged to be technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<http://mbimph.com/index.php/UPJOZ/editorial-policy>



## 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's feedback
<p><b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b></p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2. Is the title of the article suitable?</b></p> <p>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p><b>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p><b>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p><b>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p> <p><b>Yes</b></p> <p>No</p> <p>It is not good</p> <p>It lacks so many key points.</p> <p>No</p>	<p><b><u>Feedback</u></b></p> <p>U1. It is an inventory  U4. Information added  U5. General conclusion and recommendations were added  U6-U8. Keywords have been changed  U9. Reviewer's suggestion was followed  U10. Citation was added  U11-12. There is no scientific literature regarding the sentences (local source). Sentence has changed  U13. Reviewer's suggestion was followed  U14. There are no scientific evidences. I have followed scientific literatures regarding the intervals  U15. Data was added  U16-17. Reviewer's suggestion was followed  U18-19. Reviewer's suggestion was followed  U20. Reviewer's suggestion was followed  U21. Citation added</p> <p>U22. Reviewer's suggestion was followed</p> <p>U23. Sentence deleted  U24. More references were added</p>



<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Title is so informative, &amp; study period duration is appreciable.</li><li>• <b>But this article lacks so may sections; for instance:</b></li><li>• <b>Abstract section</b> lacks data analysis methods</li><li>• <b>Introduction section:</b> It lacks basic information's of the study in the globe, no detail description about the habitats of the study area</li><li>• No data analysis section at all</li><li>• <b>In method section:</b> study site description needs more info. about the habitat types, their area coverage.</li><li>• This section also lacks the core of the study.</li></ul> <p>✓ How many lines transects you used?</p> <p>✓ How you decide that</p>	
--------------------------------	---	--



	<p>number?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ How many from each habitat?</li><li>✓ What was your benchmark/reason to use that particular numbers?</li><li>✓ <b>The same questions to point count method?</b></li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>In results and discussion section;</b> I have not got any discussion at all. But it is the key components as other sections</li><li>• <b>In results section:</b> some are repeated in words and figures.</li><li>• Most of the sentences simple written without supporting appropriate citation/source.</li></ul> <p>It looks reports of an inventory to established Park...</p>	
<b>Optional</b> comments		



**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></i>	