

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57010

Title: Bird community of the damaged Natio-Kobadara dam lake in Korhogo, northern Côte d'Ivoire”.

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

Accept after minor revision.....

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

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

Reviewer's ID: JPR- ID: JPR-115.

Detailed Reviewer's Report

General Comments

The manuscript presents an **important ecological study** on bird diversity in a **degraded wetland ecosystem**. The work is relevant, especially in the context of **biodiversity conservation and habitat degradation**. The study provides **baseline data** for a previously unstudied site, which is commendable. However, the manuscript requires **major revisions** in terms of language clarity, organization, and scientific presentation before it can be considered for publication

Major Comments

1. Language and Grammar

- The manuscript contains **numerous grammatical errors and unclear sentences**.
- English needs **thorough editing by a native speaker or professional editor**.
- Example:

“was the subject of an ornithological inventory” → should be corrected to “was the subject...”

. Title Improvement

- The title can be made more **concise and impactful**.
- Suggested:

“*Bird Diversity in a Degraded Wetland: A Case Study of Natio-Kobadara Dam, Côte d'Ivoire*”

3. Abstract

- The abstract is informative but needs **clarity and simplification**.
- Avoid long sentences.
- Clearly mention:

Aim

Methods

Key results

Conclusion

- Reduce repetition and improve flow.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

4. Introduction

- Well supported with references, but:

Needs **better logical flow**.

Clearly state the **research gap**.

Objectives should be **more precise and concise**.

5. Study Area

- Description is adequate but can be improved by:

Adding **map clarity and labeling**

including **ecological significance of the site**

6. Materials and Methods

- Methodology is generally appropriate.
- However:

Justify why **Point Abundance Index (PAI)** method was selected.

Provide **sampling effort details more clearly**.

- statistical methods (PCA, GLM) need:
 - Clear explanation
 - Purpose of analysis

7. Results

- Results are detailed but:

Need **better organization and clarity**

Avoid repetition of data

Figures and tables should be:

- Clearly labeled
- Properly referenced in text

8. Discussion

- Good comparison with other studies.
- However:

Needs **deeper ecological interpretation**

Explain **causal relationships more clearly**

Reduce descriptive repetition of results

9. Conclusion

- Well written but can be improved by:

Adding **specific recommendations**

Highlighting **future research directions**

10. References

- Ensure:

Uniform citation style

Correct formatting

Update with **recent literature if possible**

Minor Comments

- Correct spacing issues (e.g., missing spaces between words)
- Standardize scientific names (italic format)

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Check consistency in: Units
Symbols
Terminology
- Improve figure captions for better understanding

Strengths of the Study

- First study on this site , Provides **valuable baseline data**
- Highlights **impact of wetland degradation**, Useful for **conservation planning**

Weaknesses of the Study

- Poor language quality
- Lack of clarity in some sections
- Limited statistical explanation
- Repetitive presentation of results

Final Recommendation

Minor Revision Required

The manuscript has **good scientific potential**, but requires **substantial improvement in language, structure, and clarity** before publication.