

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_131052
Title of the Manuscript:	Empathy and satisfaction dynamics in Veterinary Medical Interviews: insights from companion animal practice in Kerala
Type of the Article	

PART 1: Comments

	<b>Reviewer’s comment</b>  Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.	<b>Author’s Feedback</b> <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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As it was stated in the article veterinary medical interviews are pivotal to companion animal care. These interviews directly influence the pet owner satisfaction and clinical outcomes. From this perspective, studies on veterinary medical interviews are important for the profession.	Thanks
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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. It would be very useful for researchers if the abstract section included more numerical information.	Abstract has been modified with more numerical data.
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Correct.	Thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and recent.	Thanks

Review Form 3

Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable, only some cosmetic corrections should be done. Generally, spaces between words.	Spacing has been taken care of.
Optional/General comments	<p>If some corrections are made and comments are added to the points mentioned, the study will be suitable for publication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Some cosmetic corrections should be done in the article, generally, spaces between words.</li><li>- It would be very useful for researchers if the abstract section included more numerical information.</li><li>- It would be useful if a comprehensive information could be given regarding structured questionnaire.</li><li>- It is written that the study was conducted in four districts with the highest canine population (DAH, 2012) viz., Thiruvananthapuram (1,43,168), Ernakulam (1,00,045), Kollam (87,055) and Thrissur (81,344).<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1- What are the numbers in parentheses? Not clear</li><li>2- What is (DAH, 2012)? If it is a reference, it is not written among references. Not clear.</li></ul></li><li>- The study was conducted in an area where the number of dogs was high.Wouldn't the equal participation of cat owners increase the success rate of the study?</li><li>- It is stated that the questionnaire was pretested among 15 participants.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>1- How many of whom were vets and pet owners?</li><li>2- Giving a brief information regarding the results of the pretest would be useful.</li></ul></li><li>- How were 60 veterinarians selected and why was this statistical method used?</li><li>- Wouldn't conducting the study with only 60 veterinarians decrease the chance of success? Shouldn't there be more veterinarians?</li><li>- <b>Satisfaction of veterinarians with the veterinary medical interview</b>&gt;It is stated that the results was in sharp contrast to the study by Shaw et al.(2012). It would be useful if some commentscould be given regarding differences of the results between this one and the study by Shaw at al.</li><li>- <b>Perception of veterinarians about their level of empathy</b>&gt;It is stated that the results of the present study were contrary to those reported by Gautam et al.(2024) It would be useful if some commentscould be given regarding differences of the results between this one and the study by Gautam et al.</li><li>- <b>Association between level of veterinarian empathy and perception of owners the veterinary medical interview</b>&gt;It is stated that the results are contrary to the study of McArthur and Fitzgerald (2013). It would be useful if some commentscould be given regarding differences of the results between this one and the study of McArthur and Fitzgerald (2013).</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Has been done.</li><li>• Has been included.</li><li>• The structured questionnaire is not usually given in the research paper. This is available in thesis of which this paper forms a part. The scales used are mentioned in the text of the paper in the methodology section and the references are also given. These scales were used as such without any modifications.</li><li>• 1. The numbers in the parentheses refer to the canine populations in the four districts selected; four districts with the highest canine populations in the state of Kerala were selected for this study.</li><li>• 2. DAH, 2012 will be given in the reference section. It refers to the Department of Animal Husbandry, Government of Kerala.</li><li>• There are no separate figures for cats in the state census at present. It was for this reason that companion animal owners who had visited the vet during the month of the study were selected irrespective of the animal presented for examination. No specific attempt was made to study only dog owners.</li><li>• 1. In the pretest there were 15 vets and 15 pet owners selected at random from a non sampling district (Palakkad district) of the state.</li><li>• 60veterinarians were selected randomly from the districts. 15 from each. The mailing list of the Indian Veterinary Association Kerala 2023 was used as the sampling frame. This list is available for each of the districts.</li><li>• Implications of Shaw et al 2012 have already been included.</li><li>• Results of Gautam et al have already been included</li><li>• Differences in the observations of McArthur and Fitzgerald 2013 had already also been included.</li></ul>

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>	