

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMMR_120826</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Morphology of Adherent Cells of the Line Vero Cultivated in a Three-Dimensional Environment Inside a Microfluidic Device Differs from their Morphology when Cultivated in Monolayers</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Short communication</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>In this study, the authors compared the morphology of cells grown on 2D and 3D platforms, focusing specifically on Vero cells, which is an important cell line used in experiments of clinical importance, such as screening for "Shiga-like toxin" or serving as a host cell for growing viruses. Since morphology plays a crucial role in cellular function, I believe this research article will be valuable to the scientific community.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	
<p><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b></p>	<p><b>Abstract section is fine</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>It is fine</b></p>	
<p><b>Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b></p>	<p>In this study, the authors compare the morphology of Vero cells cultured on 2D and 3D platforms. The manuscript is well-written, with the methodology section providing proper information and the results and discussions well-explained. However, I believe a few suggestions from my side may improve the quality of the manuscript and enhance its readership.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is well-known that the 3D culture system is closer and more equivalent to the in vivo system, with the morphology and functions of cells being very similar to those in vivo. The unique aspect of this study is unclear. Simply changing the cell type is not a sufficient contribution to the field unless the authors meaningfully explain the purpose of the study in the introduction section.</li> <li>2. Why did the authors choose the microfluidic system over the conventional 3D scaffold system for comparison with the 2D culture system? The importance of selecting the microfluidic system in this study needs to be mentioned.</li> <li>3. I suggest including a picture or illustration of the microfluidic system (3D culture system).</li> <li>4. I recommend mentioning the major and minor axes of a cell (either a real one or an illustrated image) for better understanding.</li> <li>5. The comparison between 2D and 3D culture systems is most effective when these two systems are made of the same materials. In the 2D system, cells were attached to the polystyrene surface (if not coated with collagen), whereas, in the 3D system, cells interacted with a collagen matrix. How do the authors explain this?</li> <li>6. In the conclusion, the authors claim that "they also exhibit greater migratory capacity." I do not find any experiments regarding this claim.</li> <li>7. Although the manuscript is well-written, I suggest rechecking the spelling throughout and maintaining uniformity in using units. (For example, in the "Aim" section: use "evaluate" instead of "eveluate," and in section 2.3, use either "mL" or "ml" consistently.)</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 3**

<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> -	<b>It is sufficient and recent</b>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	It is well-written manuscript	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Not applicable	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bibhas Kumar Bhunia</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>GSMST, IIT Kanpur, India</b>