

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125694
Title of the Manuscript:	Gastrointestinal ultrasound in dogs: scientometric analysis
Type of the Article	Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript will be helpful to veterinary professionals and researchers including students.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes, the abstract is comprehensive and fulfil all the requirements.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes. Introduction part should be concised. The authors are requested to correct the title of Table -3. The authors are also instructed to strictly adhere with the journal format and instructions to authors. References be checked and cross checked thoroughly in the text and in list, and mention the doi correctly if available. Also remove old references (References before last 10 years are considered as old.)	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The presented manuscript finds scientifically and technically correct and robust because the manuscript is describing the case reports or clinical reports in a robust scientific language, the technique of USG guided diagnosis, surgical intervention and post-operative care. The discussion and conclusion part is also properly mentioned.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References be checked and cross checked thoroughly in the text and in list, and mention the doi correctly if available. Also remove old references (References before last 10 years are considered as old.)	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the manuscript can be published after minor corrections Yes	
Optional/General comments	As mentioned in raws 4, 5 and 6.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dhirenkumar Babubhai Bhoi
Department, University & Country	Kamdhenu University, India