

Name:	<a href="#">UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_3930
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A Brief Overview on Lingula species</b>
Type of the Article	

**General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

**Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presented is of utmost importance to the morphological studies of <i>Lingula</i> sp. in marine ecosystems and in evolutionary biology, since the study of molluscs is important for marine preservation.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable	
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.	In general yes, I just believe it should be more accurate.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I don't think so, I see that a section with statistical information about the results found would be interesting.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I believe that for the article to be robust it needs to be further explored, with more comprehensive and concise literature, since the topic is quite important for the academic community.	

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I believe it would be interesting to delve deeper into the references, as there are numerous works of literature that can complement the article.	
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable for the work and does not pose a problem	
Optional/General comments	Overall, the work is well defined with the objectives proposed in the reality of the article.	

**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:	Givanildo de Gois
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Acre, Campus Cruzeiro do Sul, Brazil