

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_131350
Title of the Manuscript:	Pioneering Study of Testate Amoebae in Nagi Bird Sanctuary, Bihar: A Contribution to Ramsar Site Microfauna
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer’s comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	Author’s Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The study fills a gap in knowledge about the diversity of amoebae tested in mosses from protected wetlands.Research contributes to understanding of microbial biodiversity in Ramsar ecosystems.Expands taxonomic knowledge.	
The results of this study help in the formulation of management and preservation policies for these sensitive ecosystems.	The results of this study can serve as a basis for future investigations on environmental impacts in wetlands, helping in the formulation of management and preservation policies for these sensitive ecosystems.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The text is clear and objective, presenting the context, the justification of the study and the main findings. It highlights the novelty of the research, which increases its relevance. It mentions the ecological importance of the amoebas tested as bioindicators. However, some points could be improved: The summary could be more fluid and structured, methodological details could be added and the scientific and ecological impact could be more specific, which gaps were filled and how these findings contribute to the conservation of wetlands.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	No, it could be better reformulated. To enrich the presentation of the findings, it would be valuable to include a discussion section comparing the results of this study with previous research on the diversity of amoebae tested in similar environments. This would help to contextualize the importance of the identified species and to explore potential ecological factors influencing their distribution in the Nagi Bird Sanctuary. In addition, discuss the relevance of the amoebae tested as environmental bioindicators, based on the patterns	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited in the manuscript are relevant, however, the inclusion of the DOI (Digital Object Identifier) for each reference, whenever available, would be recommended to facilitate access to the sources. Furthermore, the literature review could be better explored in the Introduction section, highlighting previous research on the diversity of amoebae tested in different habitats and their ecological relevance. Likewise, in the Discussion, the comparison of the findings with previous studies could be deepened, reinforcing the contribution of the present work to the knowledge of microbial biodiversity in wetlands.	

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English of the manuscript is understandable and suitable for academic communication, but could flow more naturally in some parts. Some sentences sound a bit stiff, and adjustments in the structure and word choice would help to make the text clearer and more engaging. A review is recommended to improve the flow and ensure that the writing sounds more natural, without compromising scientific accuracy.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript makes a relevant contribution by documenting, for the first time, the diversity of amoebae tested in mosses from the Nagi Bird Sanctuary, reinforcing their potential as environmental bioindicators. However, the inclusion of a more in-depth discussion, comparing the findings with previous studies, and the use of graphs or tables to detail the diversity found could strengthen the presentation of the results. In addition, it is recommended to insert DOIs in the references and to review the English to improve the text's fluidity. With these adjustments, the impact of the study will be even greater for the scientific community.	

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:	Ronnilda Maria Goncalves Araujo
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Mato Grosso, Brazil