

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
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

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.	Understanding these two structures i.e. chevron bones and os penis is essential for the veterinarians, academicians, researchers, and dog owners to recognize and address potential health issues, surgical conditions and to develop effective treatment and management strategies related to it	
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	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	
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.	MANUSCRIPT WAS WELL PRESENTED SCINTIFICALLY WITH GOOD PHOTOGRAPHS. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION WAS ELABORATIVE WITH PROPER EXPALANATION CLINICAL ASPECT OF THIS MANUSCRIPT WAS WELL EXPLAINED	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	YES	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	YES	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	TWO BONES MAY BE DESCRIBED SEPERATELY IN TWO SEPERATE ARTICLES INSTEAD OF COMBINING THEM IN A SINGLE ARTICLE AS THESE TWO BONE ARE NOT INTERRELATED	

Review Form 3

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:	S.Ranjith Kumar
Department, University & Country	PVNRTVU, India