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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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 chapter holds significant importance for the scientific community as it comprehensively reviews Neuronal Ceroid Lipofuscinosis (NCL), a rare yet devastating neurodegenerative disorder affecting multiple species, including humans and animals. By collating current knowledge on its pathology, genetic basis, clinical manifestations, and diagnostic strategies, it contributes to a better understanding of the disease's complexity. The chapter also emphasizes the role of genetic screening and breeding control in domestic animals, which has implications for both veterinary and comparative medical research. This cross-species perspective can guide future studies, promote early diagnosis, and support the development of targeted interventions. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Title of this chapter is generally clear and informative, but it could be made more engaging and specific to highlight the scope of the manuscript. An alternative suggestion, depending on the article's focus:**"Neuronal Ceroid Lipofuscinosis Across Species: A Fatal Hereditary Neurodegenerative Disorder"** |  |
| 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 provides a clear overview of the manuscript's content, presenting key aspects of neuronal ceroid lipofuscinosis (NCL), including its genetic basis, clinical features, and current approaches to diagnosis and treatment. However, it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the challenges or gaps in current research or treatment, as well as the significance of the findings in the broader context of neurodegenerative diseases. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | Based on the information provided, the manuscript appears scientifically correct, presenting well-established facts about Neuronal Ceroid Lipofuscinosis (NCL), including its genetic causes, clinical manifestations, diagnostic methods, and current treatment options.  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | The references cited in the manuscript are generally comprehensive, covering key studies and foundational work on Neuronal Ceroid Lipofuscinosis (NCL). However, some references are from earlier decades (e.g., 1960s to 2000s), and although they are still relevant, it would be beneficial to include more recent studies to reflect the latest research advancements in NCL.The number of references under the **"Predisposing Factors"** section seems excessive for a single general statement. In academic writing, it's important to use representative references rather than citing an exhaustive list unless absolutely necessary, such as in a systematic review or when highlighting a historical progression of research. The claim that "inbreeding predisposes to disease" can be effectively supported by 2–4 high-quality references, ideally a mix of classic foundational studies and recent key research. Excessive citations can clutter the text and distract the reader from the main point. Reducing the references to the most relevant and impactful ones would make the manuscript more concise and improve readability. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article is generally clear and understandable. However, there are areas where sentence structure could be improved for better flow and readability. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript includes an excessive number of references in some sections, particularly under the "Predisposing Factors" heading, which may distract from the main point and overwhelm the reader. A more focused approach with 2-4 key, representative references (preferably a mix of classic and recent studies) would suffice to support the claims without cluttering the text. Additionally, there are several grammatical mistakes like, “Differrential” → “differential”“computed tonography” → “computed tomography” |  |
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