



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2200
Title of the Manuscript:	Human-induced Disturbances Influence Bird Communities of Coastal forests in Eastern Tanzania

General guideline for Peer Review process: (Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper / case reports)

- *Is the problem/objective of this study original and important? SCIENCEDOMAIN international strongly opposes the practice of duplicate publication or any type of plagiarism. However, studies which are carried out to reconfirm / replicate the results of any previously published paper with new dataset, may be considered for publication. But these types of studies should have a 'clear declaration' of this matter. If you suspect any unethical practice in this manuscript, kindly write it in the report with some proof/links.*
- *Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability and technical standards of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods/process should be provided so that another researcher is able to reproduce the experiments described)*
- *Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant and current references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)*
- *Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only. Authors should provide adequate proof for their claims without overselling them)*
- *Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?*
- *SDI believes in constructive criticism. Reviewers are encouraged to be honest but not offensive in their language. It is expected that the reviewer should suggest the authors on how they can strengthen their paper to make it acceptable. Comments of the reviewers should be sufficiently informative and helpful to reach a Editorial Decision. We strongly advise that a negative review should also explain the weaknesses of any manuscript, so that the concerned authors can understand the basis of rejection and he/she can improve the manuscript based on those comments. Authors also should not confuse straightforward and true comments with unfair criticism.*
- *We are very much reluctant to go against suggestions (particularly on technical areas) of the reviewers. Therefore, authors are requested to treat the suggestions of reviewers with utmost importance.*
- *This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.*



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Line 320 -322: I find this statement, which part of the conclusion a little misleading "As adaptation to and coping with climate change gain pace among poor human populations, this will further increase extractive pressures on the forest resources in the area". How/Why should adaptation to and coping with climate change lead to increased extractive pressures yet it (adaptation/copping) is meant to (entails) reduce the effect through low impact and more sustainable livelihood options?? The second part of the sentence could be inverted to give hope and advocate that with innovations and awareness among humans populations on adaptation to and coping with climate change we expected reduced extraction pressure in future etc	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In the abstract; the sentence beginning with : Contrary As we predicted, species richness and diversity ----- Line 38: by extensive burning (WWF, 2009). As a result – Line 240 – 242 The authors may also need to explain/account for the high bird abundance observed in Msumbugwe forest -- Line 278: Regarding the lopping scale, How did the authors quantify the frequency of "no lopping" at	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	different sites to be able to obtain different values as shown in Figure 3. Line 300: densities in disturbed areas than in ~~unprotected~~ undisturbed habitats -----	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Placement of 'still' in Line 51: Yet we are still uncertain -- Line 300: Authors may wish to add this reference that support their argument here: i.e.: Mulwa R. K., Böhning-Gaese K. and Schleuning M. (2012). High Bird Species Diversity in Structurally Heterogeneous Farmland in Western Kenya. BIOTROPICA: 1–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7429.2012.00877.x Line 304: ~~The~~ Such birds include Line 322 – 324: Our findings ~~echo on~~ stress the urgency of stopping the human pressures onto these forests to ~~serve~~ save the habitat for winter visitors or passage migrants, the IUCN 324 Red-Data Book species and other birds from further declining. Line 326: -----authority (e.g. SENAPA) and ~~other~~ conservation NGOs geared	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dr. Ronald Kale Mulwa
Department, University & Country	Department of Ornithology, National Museums of Kenya - Kenya