

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJMAH_120808</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Realization of an osteological montage of domestic animals at the Museum of Anatomy of the Inter-State School of Veterinary Sciences and Medicine of Dakar</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <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 few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The study reports a non-ligament method of mounting the animal skeleton to create an osteology montage in a veterinary museum. In my opinion, it is not a new technique qualifying for a research article. Further, the authors have not discussed the uniqueness of the current method and how it differs or is superior to the other techniques.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Not suitable</b> The title should specify the method adopted for creating the montage and should not reveal the name and place of the institute. <b>Suggestion: Novel non-ligamentous mounting method to create veterinary osteology montage</b>	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Fine	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate. However, it is incomplete. The methods sections did not include the animal names used for the study. The results sections did not explain the features of the method. In spite, a caption and photographs of various animal osteology mounts are displayed. The discussion section is incomplete. The authors have not substantiated the superiority of the method adopted. The drawbacks of the earlier methods and how the current method overcomes those drawbacks are not provided. The conclusion is superficial. It fails to mention the method adopted in the study.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is not scientifically robust and technically sound. The methodology seems to be a routine procedure adopted in museum preparation. There is no novelty. To assess the scientific validity and technical soundness of the study no parameters were assessed.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Relevant	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>S. Manickam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Karpaga Vinayaga Institute of Medical Sciences &amp; Research Centre, India</b>