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|  | Reviewer’s comment **Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) I have only corrected the language and grammatical mistakes from grammerly, but not used any A.I. methods to create manuscript. |
| **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 presents a morphometric analysis of female German Shepherd across four age groups, focusing on body conformation and cranial measurements. While the topic is relevant to veterinary anatomy, breed evaluation, and has potential clinical and surgical applications, significant revisions are necessary to enhance clarity, technical depth, adherence to formatting guidelines, and overall academic tone.**  **Use “female German Shepherds” in place of “bitches” in all formal manuscript sections- including the title, abstract, methods, and discussion- to align with current scientific writing standards and ensure broad readability.** | I have replaced bitches from female. |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?**  **(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **The title is clear, specific, and reflects the subject matter adequately.** |  |
| 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 largely descriptive, with limited focus on clinical relevance, statistical interpretation, or specific morphometric indices pertinent to veterinary surgeons or radiologists. It lacks key statistical values, synthesis of findings, and results without highlighting implications. Keywords are inadequate and poorly formatted (e.g., “German Shepherd, Skull, Morphometry”).**  **Recommendation for abstract: This study aimed to evaluate age-related morphometric changes in body conformation and cranial dimensions in German Shepherd bitches to establish reference data with clinical and surgical relevance. A total of 24 healthy female German Shepherds were divided into four age groups (1 month, 3 months, 1 year, and 3 years; n = 6 per group). Linear measurements of body (height at withers, body length, back length, neck girth, heart girth, rear height) and skull (skull length, width, cranial and facial dimensions, jaw length) parameters were obtained using standard techniques. One-way ANOVA revealed highly significant differences (p < 0.001) across age groups for all measured parameters. Jaw length showed the most pronounced increase (from 3.01 ± 0.16 cm at 1 month to 19.51 ± 0.44 cm at 3 years), followed by skull length (from 9.93 ± 0.22 cm to 34.11 ± 0.51 cm), reflecting progressive mandibular and cranial elongation. It can further be elaborated as per journal guidelines.**  **Recommendation for key words: Cranial indices, Body conformation, Canine morphometrics, Breed standards** | I have inserted new abstract with limited words and more descriptive and also inserted recommended keywords. |
| Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here. | The writing shows tense inconsistency and unclear assertions. A more professional, concise, and objective tone is needed. | It may be inconsistent, since its beginning for me as a budding author, but I tried my level best to collect all the data from different kennels. |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | Inconsistent citation formats are observed some references use author names with year, while others use numerical citations. Several journal abbreviations are unclear, and some references lack complete bibliographic details. | I have corrected reference issue, and keep in mind for the upcoming submissions. |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The manuscript contains valuable data but is written in a style that feels more like a narrative. Expressions such as “inquisitive pups” and “highlighted mature dogs” are too casual for academic writing and should be replaced with more formal terms like “canines aged 1 month.” The tone and tense vary throughout, and there’s some repetition and generalization without clear quantification. To improve readability and meet journal standards, the language should be made more concise, objective, and consistent. It’s recommended to revise the text with a more professional tone, possibly with help from an academic editor. | I have tried to improve the manuscript, and will try better from the upcoming submissions |
| Optional/General comments | **The manuscript presents valuable morphometric data on German Shepherd bitches but lacks clinical interpretation relevant to surgery and radiology. Key limitations include a small sample size (n=6/group) without power analysis, exclusion of males, and no distinction between working- and show-line types. Growth influencers like diet, housing, and hormonal status are not addressed. Reliance solely on external linear measurements without imaging validation limits anatomical accuracy. The abstract and conclusion should better highlight clinical relevance. Methodological details, and sample selection need clarification. Statistical interpretation requires strengthening. The discussion lacks applied veterinary context. Language and formatting must be revised to meet journal standards.** | I have tried to improve the manuscript, and will try better from the upcoming submissions |
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|  | Reviewer’s comment | **Author’s Feedback** (It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?** |  | No ethical issues in manuscript |