

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
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 <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.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses intestinal dysbiosis in dogs, a topic that has gained attention in veterinary medicine due to its role in gastrointestinal and immune health. The study's focus on a scientometric analysis from 2011 to 2023 helps identify research trends, gaps, and key contributors in this growing field, which is essential for directing future studies. I appreciate the manuscript's methodological rigor and the clarity with which it presents its findings, particularly its use of statistical tools like R Studio to quantify data. However, more detailed visual representations of the trends and broader discussions on how this impacts treatment approaches in veterinary practice could further enhance its relevance.	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)	The title "Analysis of the Scientific Production on Intestinal Dysbiosis in Dogs" is clear and accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, for a more engaging and specific title, you might consider an alternative like: "A Scientometric Review of Research on Intestinal Dysbiosis in Dogs (2011–2023): Trends and Insights"	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in 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.	<p>The abstract of the article is generally comprehensive, as it provides a clear overview of the study's objectives, methods, and key findings. It highlights the timeframe (2011-2023), the number of articles reviewed, and some major results, such as the peak publication years and the leading contributors to the field. Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Include Specific Results: While the abstract mentions the year 2020 having the highest peak and the U.S. leading in publications, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning other key findings, such as the most cited authors or journals.Clarify Methodology: The abstract could benefit from a slightly more detailed explanation of the methods, such as the use of R Studio for data analysis and the Bibliometrix package. This addition would clarify the scientometric tools used.Relevance or Applications: Adding a sentence on how this scientometric analysis could impact future research directions or clinical applications would make the abstract more compelling for a broader audience.	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. The manuscript follows a logical and coherent structure, which allows the reader to follow the research process and findings clearly. The key sections—Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion, and Conclusion—are well-defined and follow the typical structure of a scientific paper. Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Introduction: While it provides a solid background, it could benefit from a clearer research question or hypothesis to emphasize the gap in knowledge the paper aims to address.Results and Discussion: The results are informative, but separating the Results from the Discussion might improve clarity. Presenting the data first and then discussing its implications can help readers better understand the significance of the findings.Visual Aids: Consider adding more subsections or visual aids (e.g., graphs, tables) in the Results section to break down complex data points, such as trends over time or key country contributions.	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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its well-defined methodology and use of established tools like the Web of Science database for data collection and R Studio for analysis. The authors applied scientometric methods, a recognized and reliable approach for quantitatively evaluating scientific production. The study's focus on clearly defined parameters—such as publication trends, citation data, and author productivity—demonstrates that the findings are supported by objective and quantifiable data. Additionally, the exclusion criteria applied to the dataset ensure that the	The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation.

Review Form 3

	analysis remains specific to the research topic of intestinal dysbiosis in dogs, further enhancing the scientific rigor of the manuscript.	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>:</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and relevant to the topic, covering key sources related to intestinal dysbiosis in dogs. The majority of the references are recent, particularly those from the last five years, which is essential for a topic that is evolving with new technological advancements like next-generation sequencing. Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Include More Recent Studies: While many references are up-to-date, there could be additional recent studies from 2022 and 2023, especially related to microbiome research and the latest veterinary advancements.Expand on Key Reviews: You could consider including reviews or meta-analyses on intestinal microbiota in dogs or similar animals to provide a broader context for dysbiosis and its implications.	<p>The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript uses appropriate scientific terminology and maintains a formal tone, which is important for a research paper. The key ideas are clearly communicated, and the text is easy to follow for readers familiar with the subject matter. Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Minor Grammatical Refinements: There are a few areas where minor grammatical corrections or rephrasing could improve clarity and flow. For example, some sentences could be shortened for better readability, or passive voice constructions could be balanced with more active voice for variety.Consistency in Terminology: Ensure that specific terms, such as "dysbiosis" and "microbiota," are used consistently throughout the text to avoid confusion.Complex Sentences: A few sections contain overly complex sentences that may benefit from being broken down into simpler structures to enhance readability, especially for international readers.	<p>The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.</p>
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Strengths:<ul style="list-style-type: none">The manuscript presents a well-structured and detailed scientometric analysis of a relevant topic, i.e., intestinal dysbiosis in dogs.The data is comprehensively presented, with appropriate use of statistical methods.Key findings, such as the concentration of publications and the technological advances driving research, are clearly articulated.The manuscript provides valuable insights into the publication trends, authorship patterns, and technological influences in this field.Areas for Minor Revision:<ul style="list-style-type: none">While the content is strong, the writing could benefit from slight improvements in clarity and flow, particularly in the introduction and results sections.The discussion could include more critical analysis of the limitations and future directions for research in this area.A more detailed description of the methodology, particularly the exclusion criteria for articles, would enhance transparency.	<p>The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript.</p>

Review Form 3

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>	There are no ethical issues to declare.