

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Scientific Research and Reports
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JSRR_83532
Title of the Manuscript:	Management of long bone fractures using diverse fracture fixation techniques in small animals
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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://www.journaljsrr.com/index.php/JSRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The review is given in depth in the review pane and at few places, the manuscript was corrected. Please the corrected portions may be accepted in the review option of the word document and all the corrections has to be made by the authors mentioned in the reviewing pane, without fail.</p> <p>Alignments and formats mentioned has to be followed scrupulously.</p> <p>In the reference, the authors of the manuscript followed different formats and patterns, which is unacceptable. The authors have to meticulously follow the formats and patterns of the Journal.</p> <p>The authors did not left space after a number and unit at many places. It may seem a small correction but cannot be neglected.</p> <p>In figures, the authors did not leave space between word “case” and case number. Always a space has to be left between the number and word.</p>	<p>Okay</p> <p>Corrected</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>At some places in the reviewing pane, it is mentioned that “authors may”, these were left to the choice of the authors</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>The work done by the authors is good and the writing can be improved. The manuscript is worth publishing and the work is appreciable.</p> <p>The authors should have not included a cat in the study and make it exclusive for dogs. However, necessary corrections were made and/or suggested. Make sure in future, this type of study be restricted to a single species or necessary care be taken in how you present if different species are being studied or compared.</p> <p>The authors are herewith requested and directed, not to be hurry in making reference section, as it is equally important.</p> <p>The authors are herewith also requested not to write compound sentence, unless it is very necessary. Make the sentences simple, readable, attractive with technical words and understandable.</p>	<p>Corrected as per your suggestions</p>

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	