

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58355

Title: *Surgical Management of Aural Hematoma in Dogs*

Recommendation:

- Accept as it is
 ✓ Accept after minor revision.....
 Accept after major revision
 Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality	✓			
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study:

- The study focuses on a common surgical condition in canine practice
- Clinical cases are clearly presented with relevant patient details
- Medical and surgical management are described in a practical manner
- Follow up findings strengthen the clinical outcomes
- Good quality clinical photographs support the procedures
- Discussion is supported by recent literature
- The conclusions are relevant for veterinary clinicians

Weakness of the study:

- The sample size is small and includes only twelve cases
- Only two dog breeds were included, limiting wider application
- Statistical analysis is limited and requires more detail
- Ethical approval for animal use is not mentioned
- Some figures and charts need better labeling and formatting
- The discussion could compare findings with more published studies
- Language requires minor proofreading for consistency

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents a useful clinical report on the surgical management of aural hematoma in dogs and provides practical information for veterinary surgeons. The treatment protocol is clearly described, and the inclusion of clinical photographs improves understanding of the surgical procedure. The writing is generally clear and well organized, although a few grammatical and formatting issues should be corrected during revision. The discussion is relevant but could be strengthened by providing a more detailed comparison with similar published studies. The major limitation is the small sample size and inclusion of only two breeds, which restricts the generalization of the findings. In addition, the manuscript should clearly mention ethical approval or institutional animal ethics committee clearance, even for retrospective clinical studies, to improve transparency. Overall, the study is clinically valuable and contributes useful experience, but minor revisions will improve its scientific quality and presentation.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to be an original clinical study, and there is no obvious evidence of prior publication in the submitted version. However, confirmation of originality requires a formal plagiarism screening by the journal. A routine similarity check is recommended before publication to ensure compliance with ethical publishing standards.