



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_61077
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of the form on two Lonchophyllinae skulls from Colombia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The methodology needs to be given a second look. It doesn't show originality that the nature of the topic demands 2. The topic has been reframed as suggested above 3. The abstract is not comprehensive enough as many components that a standard abstract supposed to have are missing 4. The discussion is too shallow as there are plenty works that have been done on cranial comparative anatomy that can be cited by the author (s) 	All this has been revised. Please, see changes highlighted in red.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are lots of typo-errors 2. Figure 3 is not clear enough and the level of significance is not shown 3. More pictures are supposed to be presented to show the comparison of the two species of the bat 	<p>Corrected.</p> <p>The figure 3 has been remodelled.</p> <p>In my humble opinion, figures 2 and 3, for size and shape respectively, are enough.</p>
Optional/General comments	The research has a novel idea that was not shown. The originality of the method is also questionable and the write up generally is devoid of vital information.	

PART 2:

	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?	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p> <p>The ethical approval is was not added to the article</p>	