Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Asian Journal of Biology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJOB_88448**
Title of the Manuscript:	**White-rumped Vulture's habitat suitability prediction using MaxEnt in Arunachal Pradesh**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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	**- The literature review has not mentioned any of the previous important papers. Below I added the first results from a Google Scholar search, there are surely many more papers that the authors have missed.** **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2020.106034** **https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0012374** **https://doi.org/10.5814/j.issn.1674-764x.2021.01.004** **Bhusal, Krishna Prasad, et al. "Habitat Mapping of White-rumped Vulture Gyps bengalensis, in Terai Arc Landscape of Nepal."** **(I am not an author of any of these papers, I am simply showing how the authors have not done a proper account of existing literature)** **- The data set is incredibly small.** **The authors need to justify why they have excluded the ~8,000 observations from GBIF and the data from other research papers.** **Even if the objective is to run a predictive model for the region, the above data could still be used as training data. At the very least the authors should discuss why they did not think this was needed and what the differences are between their results and the results form other regions.** **- Training and Testing data are not clearly distinguished in the methods or results. This needs to main clearer as this is a critical step in the SDM.** **- Not clear why only Arunachal Pradesh was used.** **The authors need to inform the readers as to why only this region is considered and why neighbouring areas are ignored.** **- Correlations between variables were not tested.** **This is a critical step in the SDM to ensure that models are not over-parameterised. The authors are not clear on how they have controlled for collinearity.** **- The author assumes that identified areas are the 'fundamental' niche rather than areas where there are no observations (false negatives for the observation data) or errors is the prediction. This is an overly simple interpretation of the output and needs to be reframed.**	
Minor REVISION comments	- The discussion should do make to talk about the biology of the species. - It is not indicated in Figure 1 what the red, blue, green and black lines are. - The citation style is inconsistent. - The method section about reprojecting and resampling raster images is unneccessarily wordy. This section can be reduced.	
Optional/General comments	The research is interesting and many of the necessary steps in the work flow were covered. There is value in the work as long as the above comments can be addressed or the authors decisions can be justified.	

Review Form 1.6

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?	***(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)***	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Ryan Daniels**
Department, University & Country	**University of the Western Cape, South Africa**