



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJEE_31851
Title of the Manuscript:	Gauging factors that render select trees susceptible to crop raids: An insight into Asian Elephants' seasonal foraging preferences from croplands abutting Bannerghatta National Park, Bengaluru, Karnataka, India
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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	<u>Abstract</u>: The last sentence; 'A detailed long-term...mitigation measures effectively' should read 'A detailed long-term study of foraging ecology of elephants in other human-dominated regions will help strategize human-elephant conflict mitigation measures effectively'. The use of non-elephant is confusing. <u>Introduction</u> <u>Line 20</u>: Revise the use of 'non-crop raiders' in the sentence. Confusing in sentence. <u>Line 24</u>: should be "threats" (missing an "s" at the end of the word) <u>Methodology</u> <u>Line 74</u>: Provide common names for the scientific names, since the authors tend to sometimes mention common names in the text. <u>Line 75</u>: Delete the word 'non-elephant'. <u>Line 80</u>: Please revise the use of a. and b. with (i) and (ii) respectively. <u>Line 81</u>: The sentence, 'The study period...to be possibly non-migratory months' is too long and winding. Please revise into simpler sentences. <u>Line 86</u>: 'within the 2.5 km non-elephant zone from boundaries of Bannerghatta Wildlife Range' should read 'within the 2.5 km community land buffer on the boundaries of Bannerghatta Wildlife Range'. <u>Line 87</u>: Please explain what you mean by fruiting status. Did the authors consider the stages of maturity of fruits? If so, this should reflect in the methods and	<u>1. Abstract</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>2. Introduction</u> <u>Line 20</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>Line 24</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>3. Methodology</u> <u>Line 74</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>Line 75</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected in the manuscript. <u>Line 80</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>Line 81</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>Line 86</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>Line 87</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, term clarified and highlighted in the manuscript.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	findings. <u>Line 91</u>: In order to easily distinguish between the various cluster classifications, please indicate the tree distance specifications for isolated trees and plantation as you have done for scattered trees. This is also important for repeatability of the study at another time. <u>Line 92</u>: Please provide an appropriate reference(s) for the evidence of availability and usage of wild fodder throughout the year. <u>Line 100</u>: Please indicate the specific types of analyses conducted with Excel. 4. <u>Results</u>: Foraging preferences within trees - This is an interesting study. The results should therefore be carefully presented. As the objective was to study foraging preferences within tree species, the results should be tabulated to show clearly the distinctions between three tree species. This would give added credibility to the conclusions and recommendations contained in the paper. <u>Line 145</u>: Change 10 to Ten	<u>Line 91</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>Line 92</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, reference has been cited and highlighted in the manuscript. <u>Line 100</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript. 4. <u>Results</u>: Agreed with the reviewer. Tabulating the results without using text appeared to compromise other data stated. Hence, correlation graphs for the suggested distinctions have been created, inserted in the manuscript. <u>Line 145</u>: Agreed with the reviewer, corrected and highlighted in the manuscript.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. <u>Title of manuscript</u> : Title of manuscript seems quite long and cumbersome. Authors should take steps to shorten it. Suggested modification is; Gauging factors that render select trees susceptible to elephant seasonal crop raids in croplands abutting Bannerghatta National Park, India.	1. <u>Title of manuscript</u> : Agreed with the reviewer, suggested title has been adopted with slight modifications, and highlighted in the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is an interesting study in which the authors' assess the gauging factors that render select trees susceptible to crop raids in India. Although the study question and the methods used are not particularly novel, the results add to the current literature and are of conservation importance. The study could potentially be considered for publication, once some issues raised are corrected. In general, the manuscript lacks important recommendations.	