

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_76085
Title of the Manuscript:	A CASE OF PSEUDOPREGNANCY IN A BITCH
Type of the Article	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:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	The article adds scant if any new information to the literature. The manuscript states that pseudopregnancy is a common problem in canines, and documents the clinical features. Several referenced reviews, and many others not referenced, support the simple, well established clinical management. This manuscript reports one more case, adding nothing beyond clinical features. No mechanism. No therapy. No new insight. There is nothing here which informs new approaches or management insights for other clinicians. There is no clear conclusion to the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments	The abstract, introduction, and results and discussion are highly repetitive: in many places almost word for word. Repetition should be edited out as it adds no clarity or new meaning. Several of the references are broad textbooks sections or reports: the relevance of these references should be better defined, or they should be removed.	
Optional/General comments	A routine clinical case report. Scant if any fresh content or information.	

Review Form 1.6

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Timothy Hammond
Department, University & Country	Duke University, USA