

Name:	UTTAR PRADESH JOURNAL OF ZOOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_UPJOZ_4607
Title of the Manuscript:	Gross morphological features of the bones of the forearm and manus in the Indian grey mongoose (<i>Herpestes edwardsii</i>)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.

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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript deals with a specific segment of the fore limb of the indian grey mongoose. This is a defect of the manuscript since it is submitted in a zoological journal. As an expert in osteology, I prefer a more focused study of the subject.	This manuscript deals with this specific segment as it has got the evolutionary significance and these bones undergo modifications as functional adaptations.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Ok	

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.	No The abstract must conform to the appearance of an abstract. This means that it must contain a sentence of introduction, a sentence of materials and methods e.t.c.	Abstract revised as suggested
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript requires an in depth revision	Manuscript revised by all authors as suggested
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No The references must focus on the family of Herpestidae osteology. The fact that the current references contain a vast spectrum of animals is useless.	Comparitive anatomy helps to appreciate the similarities and to correlate it with the popssible functions of adaptations. The authors feel this comparison and correlation appropriate
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No The manuscript requires a brush up of English language	The content are checked for the intended meaning
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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>	