



REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 56819

Title: Unveiling Jharkhand's Nocturnal Avifauna: First Record of Jerdon's Nightjar (*Caprimulgus atripennis*) From Jharkhand with Spatial Acoustic Evidence from Dalma Wildlife Sanctuary.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity			✓	
Significance			✓	

Reviewer Name: **ANAPANA GOPAL**

Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

1. General Comments

The manuscript addresses an important gap in nocturnal avifaunal documentation, particularly in eastern India. Reporting the first record of *Jerdon's Nightjar* from Jharkhand is potentially significant and contributes to regional biodiversity knowledge. The integration of acoustic monitoring with field observations is commendable.

However, the manuscript requires minor revision in terms of scientific rigor, clarity, language, and formatting before it can be considered for publication.

2. Content and Originality

- The study claims a first record, which is valuable, but:
 - The authors must clearly justify novelty by comparing with previous regional checklists and published records.
 - The claim of range expansion needs stronger supporting evidence (e.g., historical distribution data, eBird/GBIF references).
- The ecological interpretation (bioindicator, trophic regulator) is overstated without quantitative data.
- The inclusion of historical background (Thomas C. Jerdon) is useful but too lengthy and not directly relevant to results.

Suggestion: Focus more on new findings (acoustic + spatial data) and reduce general descriptive content.

3. Technical Quality

- Methodology lacks sufficient detail:
 - No information on:
 - Sampling duration (dates, seasons)
 - Number of recording units used
 - Sampling effort (hours, nights)

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Statistical methods for KDE
- Acoustic identification:
 - No mention of call validation (comparison with reference libraries like Xeno-canto or Macaulay Library).
- Spatial analysis:
 - KDE is mentioned but:
 - No parameters, bandwidth, or software details provided.
- Results are largely qualitative, lacking:
 - Abundance estimates
 - Detection frequency
 - Statistical support

Suggestion: Strengthen methodology and include quantitative data + reproducibility details.

4. Language and Presentation

The manuscript contains extensive grammatical and stylistic issues, including:

- Run-on sentences
- Incorrect verb usage
- Repetition (e.g., “which is...”, “these are...”)
- Typographical errors:
 - *Caprimulgusatripennis* → should be *Caprimulgus atripennis*
 - “habitatindicatorand” → spacing error
 - “Camprimulgus” → incorrect spelling
- Informal phrases:
 - “nocturnal gem”
 - “guardian of the night”

Suggestion:

- Thorough English language editing is required.
- Use scientific tone consistently.

5. Structure and Organization

- The manuscript broadly follows IMRAD format but:
 - Abstract is too long and unfocused
 - Introduction contains excessive general information
 - Results and Discussion are partially merged and repetitive
- Figures:
 - Improper labeling (Image 3 repeated)
 - No figure captions in standard format
 - No scale, legend clarity, or citation style consistency
- Study area description:
 - Coordinates are incorrectly formatted
 - Area described as “926 m radius” is unclear and likely inaccurate

Suggestion:

- Shorten Abstract (150–250 words)
- Separate Results and Discussion clearly
- Standardize figure numbering and captions

REVIEWER'S REPORT

6. References and Citations

- Formatting is inconsistent:
 - Missing journal styles
 - Improper punctuation
- Some references are incomplete:
 - Cleere (1999), Holyoak (2001) lack full details
- In-text citations:
 - Not consistently formatted (e.g., "Thakuret al.,2026")
- Over-reliance on general books rather than recent peer-reviewed articles

Suggestion:

- Follow a standard citation style (APA/Harvard/Journal-specific)
- Include recent literature (last 5–10 years)

7. Overall Recommendation

The study has potential scientific value, especially due to:

- First regional record
- Use of acoustic monitoring
- Habitat association insights

However, the manuscript currently suffers from:

- Weak methodology
- Poor language quality
- Lack of quantitative rigor

8. Final Decision

Minor Revision Required