

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	Scientific 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.	I believe it can be beneficial for readers since it is well explained and done in details.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is adequately suitable.	
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.	6 grammar problems - 0% AI - 0% plagiarism It is appropriately done.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Totally appropriate.	
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.	Introduction: 5 grammar problems - 0% AI - 0%_3% plagiarism (university.pressbooks.pub university.pressbooks.pub › test456 › chapter › layers-of-the-alimentary-canal) Part 2: 7 grammar problems - 0% AI - 0%_7% plagiarism (https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/22/9755) Part 3: 12 grammar problems - 0% AI - 0%_2% plagiarism (https://direct.mit.edu/qss/article/4/2/353/115368/Which-factors-are-associated-with-Open-Access) Conclusion: 0 grammar problem - 0% AI - 0% plagiarism –	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are well designed, appropriate and adequate.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	As aforementioned that are some grammatical mistakes which must be corrected.	
Optional/General comments	Generally the article is fine by all means.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Seyed Masoud Ghoreishi Mokri
Department, University & Country	Privolzhsky Research Medical University, Russia