

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Biology</a>
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	

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1.</b> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p><b>2.</b> Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p><b>3.</b> Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p><b>4.</b> Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p><b>5.</b> Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p><b>6.</b> Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>NO</p> <p>- <b>Title:</b> reword the title so that it has a better syntax and avoids the repetition of the word dolor.</p> <p>- <b>Introduction:</b> the comma is missing after the period in the particle et al (lines 2 and 6 of the first paragraph). Revise the years of the two references highlighted in yellow (line 4 of the first paragraph), since the author of the year 2007 should appear first before the author of the year 2010. Revise all the references highlighted in yellow (paragraph before table 1), since the order in which they are shown is not correct when taking into account the years, which is as it should be. Revise table VI, since the content highlighted in yellow is in Time New Roman, while the rest of the tables are in Arial.</p> <p>- <b>References:</b> outdated, since none of them correspond to the last five years.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>1.</b> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

**Review Form 1.7**

**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>Rigoberto Fimia Duarte</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Medical Sciences of Villa Clara (UCM-VC), Cuba</b>