

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Animal and Veterinary Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAVS_96892
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF TITANIUM MINI PLATES FOR REPAIR OF MANDIBULAR FRACTURES IN CLINICAL CASES OF DOGS
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajravs.com/index.php/AJRAVS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The work presented is of importance in the field of veterinary medicine, however it requires a review because it presents errors in the writing; You must take care of the form, style, syntax, and give order and coherence to what is intended to be demonstrated</p> <p>2. The title of the work seems appropriate.</p> <p>3. It is suggested to improve the writing of the summary, taking care of the order of ideas; In addition to adjusting to the essential elements that it must contain.</p> <p>4. The sections and structure, if they are correct, except take care of the style (due to the use of capital letters - see the guidelines of the sections - if required, change to sentence type). There are no conclusions from the work.</p> <p>5. The work can be improved both in substance and in the form of writing.</p> <p>6. References are sufficient; however, they must be written taking care of the style/form (according to the guidelines suggested by the journal), both in each of the paragraphs they support, and at the end of the list of references.</p> <p>In the method it refers to performing statistical analysis (which one?), that even in the results they speak of a significant difference, which does not agree.</p> <p>In the discussion section, they try to mention that the results obtained agree with various works carried out by other authors, but it remains to mention which circumstantial aspects are similar or different due to the findings found in the study (reason or foundation?)</p> <p>It is necessary that the authors review and adapt the manuscript with respect to the form of citation, both in each of the paragraphs that they support, as well as in the list of references, (based on the guideline of the journal, or with the characteristics of how must be submitted)</p> <p>It is important that all the figures are described with greater breadth than what is intended to be highlighted - as a finding (It is suggested to mark or point with arrows to the evidence found - with a better description).</p> <p>Improve the title of the figures (which are inserted in the text where each of them is being discussed), and take care of the presentation style.</p> <p>In the manuscript some details are marked (in color and underlined), which must be attended to, among others.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A minor revision is required regarding the writing of English</p> <p>Where available, the URLs of the references are provided. The text must comply with the style and bibliographic requirements described in the guidelines for authors.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>References must be listed at the end of the manuscript and numbered in the order that they appear in the text. Every reference referred in the text must also present in the reference list and vice versa. In the text, citations should be indicated by the reference number in brackets [3].</p> <p>Necessary suggestions to carry out</p> <p>Reference to a journal:</p> <p>1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98.</p> <p>Reference to a book:</p> <p>2. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003.</p> <p>Reference to Web-resource or Electronic articles.</p> <p>3. Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006;16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14.</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work:</p> <p>This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Benjamin Valladares Carranza
Department, University & Country	Autonomous University of Mexico State, Mexico