

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_97239
Title of the Manuscript:	Some observations on the nest site selection, nesting and other breeding behaviors of Greater adjutant stork ( Leptoptilos dubios ) in the flood plains of Kosi river in district Bhagalpur, Bihar, India
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.journalajee.com/index.php/AJEE/editorial-policy> )

## Review Form 1.7

### 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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>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>1. <b>Yes</b>, The MS tells us about the reproductive biology of one of the most threatened stork in the world and widely considered endangered Greater adjutant stork (<i>Leptoptilos dubios</i>). It exposes some aspects of the nesting and selection of the nesting site, as well as the reproductive success of the stork in three periods. These studies contribute to the knowledge of the biology of the species and provide tools that help its conservation.</p> <p>2. <b>Yes</b>, the title of the article is appropriate</p> <p>3. The abstract must be rewritten and adapted to the guidelines. For example, it has 345 words and should have a maximum of 300. the authors use non-standard abbreviations (GAS). In addition, they do not comment the aims, and the most relevant conclusions of the study.</p> <p>4. <b>I think yes but I have some comments:</b> In the Structure of the manuscript, I would include study area within Materials and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Summary of observations seems unnecessary to me.</li><li>• In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [#].</li><li>• Very long paragraphs.</li><li>• Bibliographic references are not written according to the criteria of Reference Style</li><li>• <b>Not appear in the references:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Ali and Ripley, 1987</li><li>- Istiyaq, 2001</li><li>- Burman &amp; Sharma, 2020</li><li>- Campbell <i>et al</i>, 2006</li><li>- Singha, 2002</li><li>- Tryjanowski <i>et al</i>, 2009</li><li>- Zeniszewski <i>et al</i>, 2015</li><li>- Clancy and Ford, 2014</li><li>- Burman, 2015</li><li>- Lack, 1999</li><li>- Suryabansi and Sundar, 2019</li><li>- Kahl, 1993</li><li>- Slikas, 1998</li><li>- Clancy &amp; Ford, 2011</li></ul></li><li>• <b>not cited in the text:</b><ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Ali, S. and Ripley, S.D. (1989) : A compact Hand Book of birds of India and Pakistan.</li></ul></li></ul>	

## Review Form 1.7

	<p>Oxford University Press, Bombay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Istiaq, F. (2001): Summaries of the Ph.D. theses on birds. <i>Buceros</i> 6(3): 45-51.</li><li>- Clancy, G.P. (2011) : The feeding behaviour &amp; diet of the Black necked Stork <i>Ephippiorhynchus asiaticus</i> in northern New South Water. Corel</li><li>- Islam , M.Z. and Rahmani , A.R. (2002): Threatened birds of India. <i>Buceros</i>, 7(1&amp;2) :1-102. Compiled from Threatened Birds of Asia. Bird life International- Red Data Book (2001) Cambridge. UK: Birdlife International.</li><li>- Janiszewski, T.; Mimas, P. and Wojciechowski, Z.(2015): Selective forces responsible for transition to nesting in electricity poles in the white stork <i>Ciconia ardea</i>. 103: 39-50. Downloaded from <a href="http://doi.org/105223/arde.v103">http://doi.org/105223/arde.v103</a>.</li><li>- Kahl, M.P. (1964): Food ecology of the wood storks (<i>Mycteria americana</i> in Florida. <i>Ecol. 11 Monograph</i>, 34 : 97-117.</li><li>- Kahl, M.P. (1966): Comparative ethology of the Ciconiidae. Part1. The Marabou stork, <i>Leptoptilos crumenifer</i> US (lesson). <i>Behavior</i>, 27(1) : 76-106.</li><li>- Lack, D. (1968): Ecological adaptations for breeding in birds. <i>Metheun</i>, London.</li><li>- Mishra, A; Ghosh, T.K.; Mandal, J.N., Agrawal, S.K. and Choudhary, D.N. (2010) : Protection of Greater Adjutant Stork in Bihar. <i>MISTNET</i>, 11(3) : 10-12.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The conclusions must be rewritten, must be accurate.</li></ul> <p><b>5. Yes</b>, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p><b>6.</b> The references are sufficient and recent and I do not have any additional reference suggestions.</p>	
--	---	--

**Review Form 1.7**

<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the quality of the English language is adequate for scholarly communications	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>I have some comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In Study Area Map 1 y 2 should be changed to Fig.1 and Fig.2 and the Map 2 is the same map that present Choudhary et al. 2022 only differ in sampling points, I suggest the authors to make a new one.</li><li>• In the second paragraph of page 5, it would be very useful to include a table that reflects the sampling effort by points to be able to take this as a reference for future studies and comparisons. Nest height and nest diameter are not included in table 1 and 2.</li><li>• I would delete the last paragraph of materials and methods.</li><li>• I would replace Observation and Results for Results and Discussion</li><li>• In the first paragraph of page 6 you should be more explicit, presenting more concrete results</li><li>• The information provided by graphs 1 and 2 are already present in table 1. In addition, the graphs do not show the percentage value.</li><li>• I would delete the photos; it seems to me that they do not provide relevant information.</li><li>• Page 10, graph 3 should be replaced by the corresponding figure</li><li>• page 11, chart 1 is not cited in the text.</li><li>• page 13 first paragraph. Statistical tests were not applied; therefore, it cannot be affirmed that the number of nestlings was significantly higher.</li></ul>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Eneider Ernesto Pérez Mena
Department, University & Country	Spain