

# Review of: "Social and Environmental Drivers of Black-Necked Crane (BNC) Habitat Suitability in Bhutan: Insights From Maxent Modelling and Conservation Implications"

Sharad Tiwari<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Forest Productivity

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Assessing the suitable habitats to promote and conserve the BNC population in Bhutan is an ecologically significant initiative taken up by the authors. The overall structure of the article is good, and the authors have tried to explain everything in detail. However, in my opinion, incorporating observations can technically enhance the overall quality.

1. Introduction part lacks novelty. Authors should clearly mention the novelty of their work.
2. In its current form, the research gap is missing. Authors should mention the research gap and accordingly form the research questions that they intend to fulfill through the current study.
3. Some of the sentences are too long. Like in the Introduction Section, the sentence citing Philips et al., 2006, itself is too long. The next sentence is also too long. Throughout the article, authors need to avoid such long sentences and make the manuscript crisp.
4. In the historical background paragraph, the sentence "BNC conservation is limited by limited research and resources, can be made better. Using limited twice in this sentence makes it technically weaker.
5. 2.2.2 Environmental variable. The very first sentence of this part is close to 5 lines, which is too long. Not accepted at all. In the same paragraph, one of the sentences is referred to as (See table 1). You need not to write "see," simply write (table 1). Moreover, you need not write the entire story explaining environmental variables. Just stick to what you have done, how you extracted or downloaded.
6. Keep table 1 as a supplementary table, not in the main manuscript.
7. Instead of mentioning sources in table 2, try to accommodate these sources with the relevant sentences themselves within the manuscript. So, remove table 2.
8. 2.3.3. Properly cite the sentence "Maxent, an intricate machine learning methodology rooted in the principle of maximum entropy, is applied for the examination of species occurrence data in addition to environmental variables."
9. "In this study, the Enmeval package in R was used to". Avoid "was used" together. Instead, redraft the sentence for better grammar clarity.
10. 2.3.4. The current study just used AUC to statistically validate the model performance. However, applying the TSS test offers more strength to the statistical validity of the study. Many studies have used it, and authors are advised to go through those studies.
11. Section 3.1, 3.2, Jackknife analysis - these are all part of the methodology, not results. So redraft your manuscript

accordingly.

12. Section 3.4. The paragraph concerning delineating the suitable habitat based on thresholding is also part of the methodology. It is not a result. So redraft accordingly.
13. Under the discussion section, “a fact subsequently corroborated by forestry personnel,” it is advised to avoid this type of writing. Authors can mention these corroborations in other ways. In research writing, there is nothing like “corroborated” or “supported by” any specific personnel unless it is published.
14. Under the discussion section, “Furthermore, agricultural practices, particularly the use of chemical agents and alterations in cultivation methods not favored by BNCs, pose additional challenges,” support this sentence by proper reference. Or is it the outcome of your study?
15. In the discussion section, please mention the limitations of your study. What were the constraints in the current study? How does your study contribute to strengthening the environmental knowledge base of the habitat concerning BNC? What is the future scope that your study offers? Authors can utilize the last paragraph of the Conclusion section as the concluding para for their discussion section.
16. The conclusion section is too long. The conclusion should only contain what you conclude from your study.