

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_123349
Title of the Manuscript:	Partial Fetal Maceration in a goat – A case reports
Type of the Article	Case study

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>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
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.	Reports regarding different types of reproductive failure in small ruminants like sheep and goat are rare. Mostly the cases undergo unnoticed and unreported. Further the causes and sequences are never investigated in small ruminants. There is no data available regarding frequencies or percentage of occurrence of reproductive abnormalities in these animals. In this aspect reporting maceration in goats as case study gives an insight into the prevalence of the condition in this species.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As it is a case report, the title is ok.	
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.	For the case study, the abstract is ok. However, corrections have been incorporated in track changer for the abstract. The authors need to go through it.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	subsections and structure of the manuscript is 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.	In the form of a case report the article is technically sound. The alteration in vital parameters in the presented cases are needed to be investigated like increase or decrease than normal. The detailed aseptic measures followed are needed to be explained in material methods. Kindly explain the treatment regime followed with the purposes for clear understanding of the reader. Labelling should be done inside the figures also for clear understanding. Possible reasons can be explained in the discussion part. Corrections have been incorporated in the	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Few corrections in the references have been incorporated. The authors are instructed to go through it.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Quality of English language is ok. However, corrections have been incorporated in the text.	
Optional/General comments	Comments has been incorporated in the text itslf.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sasmita
Department, University & Country	GADVASU, India