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| **PART 1: Comments** | | |
|  | **Reviewer’s comment**  **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript addresses a critical issue in biodiversity conservation, specifically the decline of house sparrows (Passer domesticus) in India. House sparrows are not only ecologically significant but also hold cultural importance in Indian society. The paper provides actionable policy recommendations that integrate habitat conservation, pesticide regulation, public awareness, and legislative support. These recommendations are timely and relevant, especially in the context of rapid urbanization and environmental degradation. The study contributes to the growing body of literature on urban biodiversity conservation and offers a comprehensive framework that can be adapted to other regions facing similar challenges. The manuscript is of significant value to ecologists, conservationists, policymakers, and urban planners. | Thank you for the valuable feedback. All the necessary feedback has been |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The title, "Safeguarding House Sparrows: Actionable Policy Recommendations for Conservation Efforts in India", is appropriate and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. It clearly indicates the focus on policy recommendations for the conservation of house sparrows in India. No alternative title is suggested. | Thank you for the valuable feedback. |
| **Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.** | The abstract is comprehensive and provides a clear overview of the manuscript. It summarizes the key points, including the decline of house sparrows, the reasons for their decline, and the proposed policy recommendations. However, it could be improved by briefly mentioning the methodology used in the study (doctrinal research and qualitative analysis) to give readers a better understanding of the research approach. Additionally, the abstract could highlight the specific outcomes or expected impacts of the proposed policies. | Thank you for the valuable feedback. All the necessary feedbacks have been incorporated and highlighted. The abstract has incorporated specific outcomes of the proposed policies. |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript is scientifically correct. The authors have used a doctrinal research methodology, which is appropriate for policy-oriented studies. The analysis is supported by recent and relevant literature, and the policy recommendations are logically derived from the findings. The manuscript does not contain any obvious scientific inaccuracies. However, the authors could strengthen the scientific rigor by including more recent studies (post-2021) to support some of their claims, especially regarding the impact of urbanization and pesticide use on sparrow populations. | Thank you for the valuable feedback. All the necessary feedbacks have been incorporated and highlighted. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references are generally sufficient and relevant to the study. However, some of the references are dated (e.g., Ghosh et al., 2010; Sharma & Srivastava, 2016), and the manuscript would benefit from including more recent studies (post-2021) to reflect the latest developments in the field. Additionally, the authors could consider adding references to international studies on urban biodiversity conservation to provide a broader perspective. For example, studies on sparrow conservation in other countries could offer valuable insights and comparative analysis. | Thank you for the valuable feedback. All the necessary feedbacks have been incorporated and highlighted. Latest references have been added to the manuscript. |
| **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?** | The language and English quality of the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear, concise, and free of major grammatical errors. However, there are a few minor issues with sentence structure and word choice that could be improved for better readability. For example, in the abstract, the phrase "This paper presents a number of policy suggestions to safeguard house sparrows in India" could be rephrased to "This paper proposes several policy recommendations to conserve house sparrows in India." A thorough proofreading would help enhance the overall quality of the manuscript. | Thank you for the valuable feedback. All the necessary feedbacks have been incorporated and highlighted. |
| **Optional/General** comments | * The manuscript is well-structured and logically organized. The introduction provides a clear background, and the methods section adequately describes the research approach. * The policy recommendations are practical and well-articulated, covering habitat conservation, pesticide regulation, public awareness, community participation, and legislative support. * The conclusion effectively summarizes the key points and emphasizes the need for a multifaceted approach to sparrow conservation. * The disclaimer regarding the use of AI tools is appropriate and adds to the credibility of the manuscript. | Thank you for the valuable feedback. All the necessary feedbacks have been incorporated and highlighted. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PART 2:** | | |
|  | **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)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** | *(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* | Even though no ethical issues suggested, necessary declaration is already incorporated before. |