

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_112321
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of zepp's procedure in management of chronic otitis externa in dogs
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. It is important in terms of investigating the effect of the Zepp method and contributing to the literature in this field.</p> <p>2. The title is appropriate.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. "Ten animals of age groups ranged from 2 years to 11 years (mean age 6 years) and body weights varied from 12 kg to 32 kg (mean body weight 24 kg) were selected for the said procedure which" the information in this section is not in the conclusion section I think it is more suitable for the surgical procedure part. In the conclusion part, our criteria are now clear and the plot is completed. We focus only on the latest data.</p> <p>5. In previous studies, it has been noted that the treatment methods applied by veterinarians today yield consistent results. The result of the study shows positive harmony.</p> <p>6. I can suggest additional references. I think these articles can also be examined and helped improve the comment section. (only advice)</p> <p>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3113813/ http://nek.istanbul.edu.tr:4444/ekos/TEZ/43291.pdf https://assets.ctfassets.net/4dmg3l1sxd6g/46FO4FjIKAy1Mb6ds0YVLh/ca4c9d20877983404aa7843cc01d8b22/lateral-ear-canal-resection-in-dogs-15726-article.pdf Özge_Hasandayıoğlu_tez..pdf (KöpeklerdeDiş Kulak YoluHastalıklarınınVideO – Otoskopik, UltrasonografiK Ve RadyografiKYöntemlerleBelirlenm esi)</p> <p>7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> "fig." in the pictures. It is more appropriate to write it as "figure" in its full form rather than abbreviated. "In ten ears, Zepp's procedure (lateral ear canal resection) was conducted. Three ears completely failed the surgery, whereas seven ears showed satisfactory follow-up results. This contrasts with the 34.9% (Tufvesson, 1955), 47% (Gregory and Vasseur, 1983), and 55% (Sylvestre, 1998) previously documented poor surgical response rates. Gregory and Vasseur (1983) ..." the percentage rate of the results in your study can also be written in the above mentioned section (If there are other statistical results, they can also be added). I think it could be more memorable for the reader this way. For semi-successful dogs; Would the result be different if the duration of medication use/drug was changed? Could there be a positive correlation between the variability of the drug parameter and the success rate of the surgery? Depending on the main topic of the author on this subject; Could it be possible to cite sources or write a final comment that would guide future articles? If yes, I suggest you add this. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	I think that the article follows its purpose and will be helpful for researchers.	

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:	Bahar Baba
Department, University & Country	Ege University, Turkiye