

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53984

Date: 23.09.25

**Title:** Abundance and distribution of carnivorous mammals in a protected area : preliminary study in the Mount Nimba Integral Nature Reserve (West, CÃ'te dÃ'Ivoire),

### Recommendation:

Accept as it is ..... **YES** .....

Accept after minor revision... ..

Accept after major revision .....

Do not accept (*Reasons below*) .....

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

Reviewer Name: PROF DR DILLIP KUMAR MOHAPATRA

Date: 23.09.25

### Reviewer's Comment for Publication.

*(To be published with the manuscript in the journal)*

*The reviewer is requested to provide a brief comment (3-4 lines) highlighting the significance, strengths, or key insights of the manuscript. This comment will be Displayed in the journal publication alongside with the reviewers name.*

### Detailed Reviewer's Report

Here's a structured **reviewer's report** on the manuscript "*Abundance and distribution of carnivorous mammals in a protected area: preliminary study in the Mount Nimba Integral Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire)*":

#### Strengths

- Relevant Topic** – Carnivore ecology in West Africa is poorly documented, and this study adds valuable baseline data from a globally important biodiversity hotspot (Mount Nimba).
- Use of Multiple Methods** – Combining **line transects** and **camera traps** is appropriate, providing complementary insights into species presence and distribution.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

[www.journalijar.com](http://www.journalijar.com)

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

3. **Preliminary Inventory** – Identification of five carnivore species across different habitats establishes an important foundation for future research and conservation planning.
4. **Conservation Relevance** – Findings highlight both species presence and habitat use, supporting management of the Nimba Reserve and national biodiversity strategies.
5. **Clear Structure** – The manuscript follows standard sections (abstract, introduction, methods, results, discussion, conclusion) with adequate references.

## Weaknesses

1. **Sampling Effort** – Only **five camera traps** and limited survey periods (2020–2024, but with few detections each year) reduce the robustness of the results. This may underestimate true species richness.
2. **Data Gaps** – Some years (e.g., 2024) reported **no observations**, which suggests insufficient survey intensity rather than absence of carnivores.
3. **Statistical Limitations** – Diversity indices (Shannon, Equitability) are calculated but with very small sample sizes, limiting interpretability.
4. **Literature Citations** – Some references (e.g., Jones et al. 2015; Kingdon & Mehtabul 2015) appear irrelevant or mis-cited (education/obesity studies instead of carnivore ecology).
5. **Language & Style** – The manuscript requires **English editing** for clarity, grammar, and flow. Some sentences are repetitive or awkwardly phrased.
6. **Mapping & Figures** – Figures (transects, distribution) are mentioned but not well described. High-resolution maps/figures would strengthen interpretation.
7. **Preliminary Nature** – The study is explicitly “preliminary,” but the limited scope makes it unsuitable for high-impact journals without expanded sampling.

## Significance

- Provides **first-hand field data** on carnivores in Mount Nimba, filling a regional knowledge gap.
- Useful for **protected area managers** and as a baseline for long-term monitoring.
- However, the **limited sampling and inconsistent results** mean the paper's significance is **regional/local**, not global.

# International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

*www.journalijar.com*

---

## REVIEWER'S REPORT

### Recommendations for Improvement

1. Expand **camera trapping effort** (number, duration, coverage) to improve detection probability.
2. Clarify and correct **citations**—replace irrelevant references with appropriate carnivore ecology studies.
3. Provide **detection histories** (number of independent records, effort) rather than only presence/absence.
4. Strengthen **maps/figures** with clearer legends and spatial distribution data.
5. Revise the **discussion** to focus on ecological insights and conservation implications rather than repeating results.
6. Improve **language editing** for grammar, conciseness, and scientific clarity.
7. Position the work explicitly as a **baseline survey** to justify the limited scope, while recommending future intensive research.