

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_83399
Title of the Manuscript:	A Comparative Study of Hair Morphology of three Carnivore families (Canidae, Ursidae and Herpestidae)
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:

(<https://www.journalajriz.com/index.php/AJRIZ/editorial-policy>)

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	The manuscript presents objectives consistent with its methodology and the findings presented. It is a research of interest and of great contribution to future analysis and, possibly, can serve as a guide for future research. However, I suggest a broad revision of the English, revision in the formatting of the text (example, spaces, paragraphs, capital letters/lowercase letters...). In addition, it needs a broad review of the journal's submission/publication rules.	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction 1 - Put the descriptor and year of the species in the first citation in the text.</p> <p>Material and methods 1 - No need to keep repeating the scientific name of the species. Do this only on the first appearance in the text. 2.2 Sample Preparation "A total of thirty (n=30) hair samples from each species (150 hair for all five species) was used for morphometric analysis." How many different individuals were these hairs collected for each species? Important data for your conclusion.</p> <p>Data analysis??? Put the name of the software that was used to make the graphics</p> <p>Results Legends of figures and tables must be self-explanatory. Add in the legends the place of collection, year of collection, species that were collected...</p> <p>Discussion Remove the topics and put them in a descriptive/argumentative way.</p> <p>Conclusion The conclusion should present its findings and their importance. I suggest a reformulation in this section. Deleting the first paragraph and writing your main findings in the research.</p>	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Welber Da Costa Pina
Department, University & Country	State University of Bahia, Brazil