

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_98002
Title of the Manuscript:	Chondropathy: The Roles of Fibroblast Growth Factor Receptors-3(FGFR3) in Skeletal Dysplasia Spectrum.
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. Yes, because it allows a better understanding of the origin and therapeutic alternatives for the pathologies in question 2. Yes 3. The summary is incomplete and does not present the structure as such, it is suggested to review it 4. Yes, although it is incomplete, the methodology and the main results are missing 5. Yes 6. More references should be added and updated It is necessary to establish the respective sections for a review article, with the content that corresponds to each one.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	can be improved	
Optional/General comments	Indicate the future perspectives of the subject, what new hypotheses arose, what aspects need to be investigated	

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:	José Ander Asenjo Alarcón
Department, University & Country	National Autonomous University of Chota, Peru