

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_125811
Title of the Manuscript:	The Nervus Intermedius of Wrisberg: Anatomy and Functions
Type of the 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 is important for the scientific community because of the innervation of NIW. It supplies important salivary glands. Further research on the functions of NIW could provide important therapeutic implications.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes the title is 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.	Abstract is comprehensive. I would suggest to add some details of functions of NIW.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Main heading of "Functions of NIW" are missing that was the main theme of the manuscript.	
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.	This manuscript is scientifically correct because the author has covered all important area. I would just suggest to add functions of NIW as they are very important.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	More than 50% of the references are of more than 5 years of duration. Kindly review and add new references.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the language is suitable.	
Optional/General comments	No plagiarism is suspected No there are no competing interest issues.	

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:	Rubab Rameez
Department, University & Country	Islamabad Medical and Dental College, Pakistan