

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_106471
Title of the Manuscript:	Novel records of testate amoebae (Amoebozoa and Cercozoa) from Shenthuriney WLS, Kerala
Type of the 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:

(<https://www.journalsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES (The manuscript is important for the scientific community as it presents novel findings regarding the diversity of testate amoebae in a biodiverse hotspot, filling a gap in our understanding of this microorganism group in the Western Ghats of Kerala. These findings contribute to broader ecological studies and underscore the need for further research in this area.)</p> <p>YES (The title of the article effectively conveys the subject matter but could be made more concise for clarity. An alternative title might be "New Records of Testate Amoebae in Shenthuriney Wildlife Sanctuary, Kerala: Insights into Microbial Biodiversity.")</p> <p>The abstract provides a reasonably comprehensive overview of the study's objectives and findings. However, it could be improved by including more specific results or conclusions, offering readers a more detailed glimpse of the research.</p> <p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, providing a logical flow from introduction to methods, results, and discussion. However, the discussion section could be enhanced by including more ecological interpretations and comparisons with prior studies.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct, with clear methodologies and well-documented findings. However, adding statistical analyses or ecological interpretations to the results would strengthen the scientific rigor.</p> <p>The references are relevant and mostly recent, contributing to the scientific credibility of the manuscript. However, the inclusion of additional references related to testate amoebae biodiversity or ecological studies in the Western Ghats might provide valuable context for the readers.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Title: Consider making the title more concise for clarity. An alternative could be "New Records of Testate Amoebae in Shenthuriney Wildlife Sanctuary, Kerala: Insights into Microbial Biodiversity."</p> <p>Abstract: The abstract is informative but could be improved by including specific results or conclusions to provide readers with a more detailed overview of the research.</p> <p>Introduction: The introduction is well-written and provides a comprehensive background. However, you may want to consider condensing some of the descriptive information to maintain reader engagement.</p> <p>Materials and Methods: The methodology is clear and concise. It's a good practice to mention the geographic coordinates of the study area for precision.</p> <p>Results and Discussion: While the results are presented clearly, the discussion section could benefit from more ecological interpretations and comparisons with prior studies to enhance scientific depth.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>References: The references are relevant and recent, contributing to the scholarly quality of the manuscript. However, consider formatting them in a consistent style, following a particular citation style guide if required.</p> <p>Assessment of Language/English Quality: The language and English quality in the manuscript appears to be generally suitable for scholarly communications. However, there are some areas where improvements in clarity and conciseness could enhance the manuscript's readability and impact. Proofreading and editing for grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure are recommended to ensure the highest language standards in scientific writing. Consider seeking feedback from a proficient English speaker or professional editing services if needed.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Prashant. Vaijinath
Department, University & Country	Gulbarga University, India