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| PART 1: Comments | | |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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.** | This manuscript provides valuable insights into the characterization of animal cruelty cases, contributing to the growing body of research on the link between such crimes and broader social and psychological issues. By identifying patterns among victims and perpetrators, the study enhances understanding of risk factors associated with animal abuse, which can inform preventive measures and legal frameworks. Additionally, the findings emphasize the need for stronger public policies and awareness campaigns, highlighting the role of veterinary services and law enforcement in addressing these cases. This research not only supports animal protection efforts but also underscores the societal implications of animal cruelty, reinforcing its relevance to both criminological and psychological studies. | The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The current title, **"Crime of Animal Cruelty Against Dogs and Cats: Characterization of the Victim and the Perpetrator in a Retrospective Study,"** is clear but could be slightly refined for better readability and impact. A more concise and engaging alternative could be:  **"Animal Cruelty Against Dogs and Cats: Victim and Perpetrator Profiles in a Retrospective Study"**  This version removes redundancy ("Crime of" is unnecessary since "Animal Cruelty" already implies a criminal act) and improves flow while maintaining the key elements of the study. | The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript. |
| 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 is generally well-structured and provides a clear summary of the study, including its objectives, methodology, key findings, and implications. However, a few improvements could enhance its comprehensiveness and clarity:   1. **Clarify the Study’s Contribution**: While the abstract mentions the significance of the findings, it could explicitly highlight how this study fills a research gap or contributes to policy-making and animal protection efforts. 2. **Specify the Methodology in More Detail**: The abstract mentions data collection but does not describe the criteria used for selecting cases or the analytical methods employed. Briefly mentioning these aspects would enhance transparency. 3. **Expand on the Implications**: The conclusion emphasizes the need for public policies and awareness campaigns, but it could also touch on legal or psychological interventions based on the study's findings. 4. **Consider Removing Redundant Information**: Some details, such as the breakdown of case referrals (rescues, advocacy groups, residents), while useful in the full article, may not be essential in the abstract. Instead, focusing on broader patterns and trends might improve readability.   **Suggested Revision of the Last Sentence:** "This study highlights the urgent need for stronger legal frameworks, public policies, and intervention programs to prevent animal cruelty and address its broader social and psychological implications." | The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It follows a structured methodology, clearly defining case selection, classification of cruelty, and data recording procedures. The study is grounded in established literature, referencing McMillan (2005) and Tostes et al. (2017) for classification criteria. The clinical and forensic data are systematically presented, including tables summarizing the individual characteristics, clinical aspects, and case outcomes. Additionally, the manuscript provides a transparent description of therapeutic interventions and legal actions taken against perpetrators. The use of photographic evidence to document cases further strengthens the reliability of the findings. Overall, the study is methodologically sound and presents valid scientific conclusions. | The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | The references used in the manuscript are relevant to the topic and include key sources | The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communication, as it maintains a formal and academic tone. The terminology used aligns with the scientific and legal aspects of animal cruelty investigations. However, minor grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and occasional wordiness could be refined to enhance clarity and readability. Improving sentence structure, ensuring consistency in verb tense, and refining transitions between ideas would further strengthen the manuscript’s readability and professionalism. A thorough proofreading or professional language editing service is recommended to ensure linguistic precision and fluency. | The authors agree with the reviewer's evaluation. The changes have been made and highlighted in the manuscript. |
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|  | **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)* | There are no ethical issues to declare. |