

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 (Herpestes edwardsii)
Type of the Article	Research 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 study of the skeleton along with the study of the musculature and internal organs of different species of animals enrich the field of animal research on the planet being a welcome one. The study of the skeleton of the Indian grey mongoose is	

	important for the scientific world because it helps to understand the lifestyle and behavior of this animal species.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable.	
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.	The abstract of the article is well done.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The author(s) reviewed many articles from the literature to confirm their observations.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references sufficient for an research article (25) and relatively recently (21 of them is after year 2000), I think it is very good.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. The language quality are suitable for scholarly communications.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In my opinion the article can be published after minor revisions. Please make the corrections suggested by me on the full article. PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mihai- Iacob BeŃea
Department, University & Country	University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine from Cluj-Napoca, Romania