

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_84777
Title of the Manuscript:	A preliminary report of Testate Amoebae (Protozoa : Tubulinea and Cercozoa)) in Govind Wildlife sanctuary, Uttarakhand, India
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.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

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	1.Please check whether the study area is a WLS or National Park 2. Graph showing species list (Fig.3.)in the MS to be changed/modified	1. Study area, Govind National Park, Uttarakhand, India Modified as per suggestion 2. Graph showing species list (Fig.3.)in the MS modified
Minor REVISION comments	1. More appropriate Keywords to be included. 2. The identification process (if from any pictorial guide book, or identification keys) and distribution details of recorded fauna is to be mentioned and authenticated	1. Keywords included like, Testate Amoebae, Protozoa, Tubulinea, Cercozoa, Govind Wildlife sanctuary, Uttarakhand, India 2. Identification process followed as per current Global Taxonomical standards, Like : (Classification followed is Adl et al. (2019).
Optional/General comments	Minor formatting errors	Minor formatting errors corrected

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) Agreed with the reviewer and corrected the MS accordingly.
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No ethical issues in this manuscript