

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_126853
Title of the Manuscript:	RIGHT VENTRO-LATERAL MULTIPLE TRAUMATIC ABDOMINAL HERNIA IN A 1½ -YEAR-OLD BALAMI RAM: A CASE REPORT
Type of the Article	Case report

#### **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	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Ventral and lateral hernia are common in small and large ruminants, may be congenital or acquired. However, the same animal having multiple henial ring in body wall are less frequent. As a case report, it may be useful for field vets. The same methodology can be used by field practitioners, so is useful for them. It has not very much academic importance.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. Already suggested in the manuscript in revision (by track changes).	
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.	Not properly written. It should include only case history, diagnosis and treatment in brief along with final outcome. So should be properly rewritten.	
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.	The methodology for diagnosis and specially the intra and post-operative observation along with treatment regimen are not proper. All has to be rewritten in a clear and concise way.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, but not may are required.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Not.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The article should be sent back to author for major revision. He should write it in a clear and concise way. If needed should consult some English expert also. Then should resubmitted for further review and processing.	

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>R N Chaudhary</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>LUVAS, India</b>