

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_120808
Title of the Manuscript:	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
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 is a fairly straight-forward study on the preparation and inclusion of osteological specimens and articulated skeletons in a museum setting. The study provides detail about how the specimens were acquired and prepared, allowing for others to potentially use these same methods, or similar methods, to do the same things. They also show the variation of skeletons on display at the museum, providing more details about possibilities for others. The variation in these skeletons, particularly with some of the dynamic poses, is particularly useful. Combining the described methods, the variation in species and poses, and restating the usefulness of these types of specimens for students, researchers, and the public are the most important aspects of the study and are all useful things to be published on.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title does convey the major purpose of the study.	

Review Form 3

<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p>The importance or usefulness of the articulated and mounted skeletons should be stated toward the end, or at the end, of the abstract helping convey the importance of doing this and placing it in a larger context.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>These are ok although some are quite short and having subsections constrained to a single sentence seems too short to me. I would suggest adding a couple sentences to these or potentially combining some of the subsections.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The key scientific portions of the paper deal with the methods used to prepare the specimens. Here enough details were provided to allow the reader to understand the process and potentially use it, or portions of it, moving forward. However, as noted in the comments in Track Changes, it would probably be better to move through the process as it was done by the authors, so portions should be rearranged to follow the process as it would have occurred.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. =</p>	<p>There are a relatively small number of references. There are others that could be used and added. While many of the available resources are focused on things like the display of human skeletons, which are certainly not the same thing, the usefulness of each is similar, with there being for students, researchers, teachers, and the public to help convey information. For the references though, make sure the references are complete within their section with all the necessary information and make sure they all follow the same format.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Overall it is very good, although I have made a few corrections and notes in the Track Changes version of the manuscript.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Overall well done and the paper conveys what it sets out to. The figure captions should be made more complete and provide more information though.</p> <p>Additionally, the sections detailing some of the skeletons on display are all single sentences with a figure set up around each. These act like single sentence paragraphs and feel disconnected. I think it would be much better to combine each of those sentences together and cite each figure with the given sentence. Then just provide the figures after that single paragraph, with each figure consecutively after the previous one. This will also require the figure captions to be a bit more detailed with the species in each and perhaps something about the pose used for the mounted skeleton.</p> <p>Also, to retain as much scientific accuracy as possible, I would suggest trying to include scientific names, when possible, for the various animals and species, particularly as common names can vary.</p> <p>Overall, the paper does not have a lot of distinct scientific information, but the information is does include is accurate and can be used by others, although rearranging it would be more useful.</p>	

Review Form 3

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:	Steven E. Jasinski
Department, University & Country	Harrisburg University of Science and Technology, United States