

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_115238
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical Obstetrical Management of Dystocia Due to Uterine Torsion and Faulty Disposition of Foetus in Banni Buffalo
Type of the Article	Case Report / Case Study

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://journalijbcr.com/index.php/IJBCRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	 1. Yes, the manuscript is important for communication with corrections 2. The title seems appropriate to me 3. The summary is not complete, the general remarks must be considered to correct it. 4. The structuring must be corrected according to the general remarks 5. Yes, it is suitable 6. See the few corrections in the general remarks	 Ok Thank You Thank You Suggestions incorporated Ok Thank You Ok Thank You Thank You
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	GENERAL REMARKS 1. SUMMARY The abstract part deserves a clear separation of the following small sections: introduction, method, results and conclusion. In the introduction the authors must specify the aim of the study; in the method part, they must mention the type of study and the procedure used to arrive at the intervention. In the results section, they must summarize the results that they have already presented here in the summary; And then in the conclusion, they must shed light on the continuation of the evolution of the buffalo after their intervention and their final consideration of the intervention applied. 2. INTRODUCTION As for the general introduction, we ask the authors to specify towards the end the place of their study (importance) in relation to other studies already carried out, as well as the aim of the study. 3. MATERIAL AND METHOD We propose the separation of this part into two points: (2.1) Health History and (2.2) Clinical Observation, in order to allow a good reading of the situation. 4. RESULTS The title results must appear before discussing the aspects of management. 5. REFERENCES We suggest adding DOIs for cited articles if there are any.	 Ok Thank You

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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>	