

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	DIAGNOSTICS OF PATHOLOGY IN THE LUMBAR AND LUMBOSACRAL SPINE OF DOGS USING PLAIN RADIOGRAPHY, MYELOGRAPHY, AND COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3149
Title of the Manuscript:	DIAGNOSTICS OF PATHOLOGY IN THE LUMBAR AND LUMBOSACRAL SPINE OF DOGS USING PLAIN RADIOGRAPHY, MYELOGRAPHY, AND COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY
Type of the Article	Complete Book

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 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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
=		

Review Form2

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/Generalcomments</p>	<p>My peer review comments-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>“This is a well-written manuscript that only needs to undergo a few minor changes. First, ...”</i> 2. <i>“The manuscript is based on impressive empirical evidence and makes an original contribution. Only minor revisions are needed before it can be published.”</i> 3. <i>“I thoroughly enjoyed reviewing this manuscript and only have some minor requests for revision.”</i> 4. <i>“The authors develop a unique theoretical framework, and I believe that they should highlight their originality much more.”</i> 5. <i>“The authors conduct very relevant research, but fail to emphasise the relevance in their introduction.”</i> 6. <i>“The authors draw on extensive empirical evidence. I believe that they can put forward their arguments much more confidently.”</i> 7. <i>“To improve the readability of the paper, I suggest dividing the analysis into several subsections.”</i> 8. <i>“Figure 3 is difficult to read and should be adjusted.”</i> 9. <i>“Table 1 and 2 can be combined to create a better overview.”</i> 10. <i>“The abstract is too long and should be shortened.”</i> 11. <i>“I had difficulties understanding the first paragraph on page 5, and suggest that the authors reformulate and simplify it.”</i> 12. <i>“The manuscript contains an elaborate literature review, but definitions of the key concepts are needed in the introduction.”</i> 13. <i>“Throughout the manuscript, there are several language mistakes. Therefore, I recommend a professional round of language editing before the paper is published.”</i> 14. <i>“The paper should undergo professional language editing before it can be published.”</i> 	

PART 2:

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

[Review Form2](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Yudhithir Panwar
Department, University & Country	India