

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_115861
Title of the Manuscript:	GROSS ANATOMICAL STUDIES ON FACIAL BONES OF THE SKULL OF INDIAN MONGOOSE ( <i>Herpestes javanicus</i> )
Type of the Article	Original Research 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://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy> )

### 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>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) Yes.</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. The authors focus on <i>Herpestes javanicus</i>, but merely list what generally applies to mammalian skulls. Features specific to this animal are almost never mentioned, and there are no discussions of any kind.</p> <p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. The present abstract just rambles on about the results and does not address any scientific questions, considerations or the significance of using mongoose. The authors should rewrite the abstract in a completely different way.</p> <p>4. They need Discussion section.</p> <p>Hadi, H. D., &amp; Yousif, N. H. (2023). A COMPARATIVE-MORPHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SKULLS IN TWO SPECIES OF CARNIVOROUS AND HERBIVOROUS MAMMALS. <i>Bulletin of the Iraq Natural History Museum</i> (P-ISSN: 1017-8678, E-ISSN: 2311-9799), 17(3), 507-517.</p> <p>Loupe, V., Fabre, A. C., Lorvelec, O., &amp; Veron, G. (2024). Head morphology reflects the introduction history in a globally invasive carnivore—the small Indian mongoose. <i>Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society</i>, 200(3), 837-847.</p> <p>Upham, N.S., Esselstyn, J.A., and Jetz, W. (2019). Inferring the mammal tree: Species-level sets of phylogenies for questions in ecology, evolution, and conservation. <i>Plos Biol</i> 17, e3000494.</p> <p><b>Page 1, Introduction</b></p> <p>".... . is considered the oldest genus within the order Carnivora" What is meant by "oldest genus" in this sentence? Does it mean the earliest phylogenetic divergence, or is it the earliest known fossil mongoose in the Carnivora? Indeed, It cannot be the former, at least in modern molecular phylogeny. The authors should clarify the details.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></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>Hiroki Higashiyama</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>SOKENDAI: The Graduate University for Advanced Studies, Japan</b>