

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_129284
Title of the Manuscript:	Cancer Diagnostic and Therapeutic Considerations in Dogs: A Review
Type of the Article	Review 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is of interest to the scientific community because it presents in a concise manner and on the point the main diagnostic and treatment methods used in oncological diseases in dogs. A key benefit of this review is represented by the fact that the authors have opened up both traditional and more advanced diagnostic and therapy methods, specifying the cases in which these are better suited. This review is useful both for researchers and for oncological veterinarians because the advantages and disadvantages of diagnostic and treatment methods used for neoplastic conditions in dogs are highlighted in a concise manner.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable for the manuscript.	
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, the abstract is comprehensive. However, I would recommend to add a sentence in the abstract regarding the purpose of this review and the importance of the information provided.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	From my point of view, the information is scientifically correct and properly structured.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are proper and sufficient; it includes a reasonable number of recent references.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, from my point of view the English quality of the manuscript is ok but I am not a native English speaker.	
Optional/General comments	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript. There are no competing interest issues in this manuscript. I did not identify plagiarism in the manuscript.	

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:	Alexandru Diana Mihaela
Department, University & Country	University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine, Romania