

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_116593
Title of the Manuscript:	Bovine renal lipofuscinosis in a Tanzanian crossbred yearling male calf: A case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>While BRL has been reported in various countries, this case adds to the understanding of the disease's distribution and presentation. Additionally, the discussion of differential diagnoses and the conclusion regarding the incidental nature of the finding contribute to the scientific community's knowledge about this condition.</p> <p>This title effectively communicates the subject matter of the manuscript</p> <p>It effectively summarizes the key findings even though it needs minor improvement.</p> <p>Each section is clearly defined and contributes to the overall understanding of the case. The presentation of the case history, pathological findings, and conclusion are well-organized and easy to follow. Discussion of differential diagnoses need to be improved.</p> <p>The manuscript appears scientifically correct, as it provides detailed descriptions of the necropsy findings, differential diagnoses, and relevant background information about BRL. The conclusions drawn from the gross pathology observations are supported by logical reasoning and existing literature. However, it would benefit from additional confirmation through histopathological examination to further validate the diagnosis of BRL.</p> <p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be relevant and recent, providing support for the discussion and conclusions presented. However, since histopathology was not conducted in this case due to budget limitations, it could be beneficial to include references discussing the histological features of BRL for a more comprehensive review of the condition. Additionally, any recent epidemiological studies or reports on BRL in African cattle populations could strengthen the discussion of its prevalence and distribution.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>It needs some minor correction.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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:	Mohammadreza Allahyartorkaman
Department, University & Country	National Taiwan University, Taiwan