

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-58388

Title: *Dehorning as the Surgical Management for Horn Fracture in a Buffalo: A Case Report*

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 manuscript presents a clinically relevant veterinary surgical case
- Case history, diagnosis, surgery, and postoperative care are clearly described
- Clinical photographs effectively demonstrate the surgical procedure and healing
- The treatment protocol is practical and easy to follow
- The discussion is supported with relevant published literature
- The clinical outcome is clearly documented
- The report has educational value for veterinary practitioners

Weakness of the study:

- The report is based on a single clinical case
- Long term follow up beyond wound healing is not available
- Ethical approval and owner consent are not clearly mentioned
- Laboratory investigations are not included to support diagnosis
- Minor grammatical and formatting corrections are needed
- The discussion could compare more similar published cases
- Some references require consistent formatting

Reviewers Comments:

The manuscript presents a well-documented case of surgical management of a complicated horn fracture in a buffalo using dehorning. The clinical history, diagnosis, surgical procedure, postoperative care, and outcome are presented in a logical and easy-to-understand manner. The inclusion of sequential clinical photographs improves the educational value of the report and helps readers understand the procedure. The discussion is relevant and supported by published literature. However, the manuscript would benefit from careful language editing to correct minor grammatical and formatting issues. The authors should clearly state whether institutional ethical approval was required or exempted and confirm that informed owner consent was obtained for treatment and publication of clinical photographs. As this is a single case report, the limitations regarding generalizability should be acknowledged more clearly. A longer follow-up period would further strengthen the clinical significance of the report. Overall, the manuscript is informative and suitable for publication after minor revision.

Previously Published anywhere/Plagiarism check:

The manuscript appears to describe an original veterinary case report, and no obvious evidence of prior publication or duplicated material was identified during this review. However, the journal should perform a routine plagiarism similarity check before publication to confirm originality and ensure compliance with accepted publication ethics.