

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Archives of Current Research International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_122983
Title of the Manuscript:	CHEVRON BONE AND OS PENIS IN DOG: STRUCTURAL AND FUNCTIONAL ANATOMY
Type of the Article	Original Research 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**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 feedback here)</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.	This manuscript was suitable to the anatomist and also useful for clinician and surgical field due to the more case of urethral obstruction and peneal defect and used as guideline for another authors in this field, the information are very good, the parameter are need to improve.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	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.	The abstract is very well and I don't have any suggestion about this part	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The all subsections and structure of the manuscript are accepted	
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 a scientific research but has no novelty in this line because it has classic information ,our opinion is accepted but we think that the extension of the os penis that recorded in this manuscript was not correct we think that the extension of the os penis is from the proximal part of the boy to the tip not from the root as mention in the paragraph of os penis 3.2.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	All references were suitable	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The English language is good for scholarly communications.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The <b>manuscript</b> is very nice and has a good benefit in practise field	

### Review Form 3

#### **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>Mohammed Sulaiman Dawood</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Baghdad University, Iraq</b>