

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Zoology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIZ_89065
Title of the Manuscript:	Wildlife Forensics: A Case Study on Golden Jackal Canis aureus in India using canid head and tailor-made musk pod
Type of the Article	Case study

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>)

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	<p>First of all, I want to thank you for choosing me to comment on your work. Then I congratulate you on your work. I found your work to be especially well detailed. However, there are just few typos to correct:</p> <p>1) page (3), line (1) The canid head sample was marked as 'Seizure 1' (Fig 1). -----> In the (Fig 1), it was marked as 'a'</p> <p>2) page (3), line (2) the suspected musk pod was marked as 'Seizure 2' (Fig 1) -----> In the (Fig 1), it was marked as 'b'</p> <p>3) page (5), lines (18) et (19) The distances between 12S rRNA sequences of query samples and NCBI database entries ranges from 0.000 to 0.005 -----> The distances between 12S rRNA sequences of query samples and NCBI database entries range from 0.000 to 0.005</p> <p>4) page (5), line (20) It is observed from the matrix that query sequences does not have any divergence with -----> It is observed from the matrix that query sequences do not have any divergence with</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samar Chtiba
Department, University & Country	University of Tunis El Manar, Tunisia