

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_116787
Title of the Manuscript:	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON PAIN IN HORSES DURING COLIC: Understanding visceral abdominal pain for the right therapeutic choice
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes. It explains the pathophysiology of the equine colic in an elaborative manner, starting from the basics of anatomy to the evident based therapy, which will help the clinician to choose the right drug. Yes. Appropriate Need corrections in methodology, as mentioned in General comments Yes. But authors guidelines need to be followed. Yes. Needs inclusion of recent references (mentioned in comments section) 	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology of the manuscript says it is a survey taken in few areas. But its impact is nowhere mentioned in the article. Either it should be removed from methodology or its impact should be included in the review, which will make the manuscript a complete one. Corrections mentioned in the manuscript as 'comments' may be attended to improve the quality References in the running material of the manuscript need to be revised, following the author guidelines Few references quoted in the text are missing in reference section -Ex. GLUNTZ, 2009 Refences to be arranged in alphabetical order Being a review article, try adding some recent references. The latest reference given is 2018. Adding recent refences will further improve the quality of manuscript. 	

[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:	C.S. Arunaman
Department, University & Country	Tamil Nadu Veterinary and Animal Sciences University, India