

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Advances in Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125689
Title of the Manuscript:	A Scientometric Review of Research on Intestinal Dysbiosis in Dogs (2011–2023): Trends and Insights
Type of the Article	Review

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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript doesn't address the issue widely and in detail. The title is well structured and attractive for the scientific community.	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No, nothing to add	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation.
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.	Good, it encompasses the issue	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Mostly, but there mismatching in spacing through out the manuscript needing to be corrected	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is not manuscript is scientifically robust, since it is dealing only few information and methodological approaches to be scientifically sound.	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation.
Minor REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	More or less	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.
Optional/Generalcomments	it deals the journals publishing about the gastrointestinal dysbiosis in dogs.	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	There are no ethical issues to declare.