

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_126541
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF EQUINES AS AN EXPERIMENTAL MODEL IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript offers a clear and organized review of horse selection based on the unique requirements of therapeutic, antivenom, and sports activities. The thorough presentation of research methodologies and the inclusion of various studies enhance the credibility and informative nature of the review.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Equines as Experimental Models: A Review of Their Use in Therapy, Antivenom Production, and Sports"	
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.	Clarify the objective: Methodology detail: The abstract states that a search was conducted in specific databases, but it does not detail the type of studies reviewed (e.g., observational, clinical trials, or reviews). Including this could add depth. <input type="checkbox"/> Results and key findings: While the abstract outlines the focus areas (hippotherapy, antivenom production, equestrian sports), it does not mention any specific results or significant insights gained from the review. Including a brief mention of major findings or conclusions would strengthen the abstract. Conciseness and focus: The abstract could be streamlined by reducing some descriptive elements about horses (e.g., "quadrupedal mammal with a cylindrical body") and focusing on the main outcomes and implications of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Methodology Details: The Methodology section could benefit from more detail about the search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and types of sources reviewed. This would enhance transparency and reproducibility. Uniformity of Subsections: Ensure that each subsection within the Results and Discussion is equally detailed. For example, the part on equestrian sports is extensive and supported by numerous references, while the section on antivenom production could be expanded with more specifics or examples. Consistency in Subheading Style: The manuscript should have uniform subheading formats (e.g., bolded or numbered consistently). Discussion Points: It may be helpful to include a brief "Discussion" or synthesis at the end of the Results and Discussion section to compare and contrast findings across the three areas of focus. Table Placement: The table in the equestrian sports subsection is helpful but should be clearly referenced in the text before its appearance.	

Review Form 3

<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>Update older references where possible with newer, more current studies. Include recent publications that provide insights into horse selection criteria for therapeutic, pharmaceutical, and sports purposes.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Horses are affectionate animals, large in size, easy to handle, and capable of forming bonds with humans" could be simplified to avoid redundancy (e.g., "Horses are large, affectionate, and easy to handle, capable of forming bonds with humans").</p> <p>The sentence "For the profile of horses selected in hippotherapy, motor, morphological and behavioral aspects were taken into account" could be clearer. It might be rephrased to: "Horses selected for hippotherapy are evaluated based on motor, morphological, and behavioral characteristics."</p> <p>For example, "In Brazil, horses are used as an experimental model for antivenom production" could be followed by a sentence elaborating on the specific role of horses in this context.</p> <p>the use of terms like "profile" for horses in different contexts (hippotherapy, antivenom production) could be confusing. It's essential to make sure that terms are used consistently and defined clearly, particularly if they refer to different selection criteria in different contexts.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The citations in the text (e.g., [1], [9], [16]) should be formatted according to the style guide required for the publication (e.g., APA, MLA, Chicago). The references themselves (in the bibliography) should be consistently formatted and complete.</p>	

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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Yousra Nomeir</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>College of Medicine and Health Science, Sultan Qaboos University, Oman</p>