Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**Archives of Current Research International**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ACRI_125334**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Cell Therapy in Rabbits: Advances, Applications and Perspectives in Regenerative Medicine**
Type of the Article	**Minireview Article**

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	**Reviewer's comment**	**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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This manuscript is valuable for the scientific community as it highlights the role of rabbits in advancing cell therapy research, particularly in regenerative medicine. The paper provides a clear understanding of the advantages of rabbits in terms of biological relevance and experimental feasibility. I appreciate how the manuscript bridges the gap between preclinical animal research and potential therapeutic applications for humans. This perspective is crucial for shaping future research directions and enhancing the translational impact of cell therapy studies.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**Suggested title "Advances in Cell Therapy Using Rabbit Models for Regenerative Medicine"**	
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.	**Suggestions are attached**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes**	
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.	**The manuscript demonstrates scientific robustness through its comprehensive literature review on the role of rabbits in cell therapy studies, highlighting their physiological similarities to humans and their utility as an experimental model. By systematically analyzing relevant articles from reputable databases like PubMed and Science Direct, the authors provide a solid foundation for understanding the advancements and applications of cell therapy in rabbits. Additionally, the inclusion of recent studies that showcase the efficacy of various therapies reinforces the manuscript's technical soundness, offering valuable insights into regenerative medicine. Overall, the thorough methodology and critical analysis of the current state of research contribute to the manuscript's scientific integrity and reliability.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**Please add a recent reference**	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**Improve the English language and grammatically correct it**	
Optional/General comments	*Check scientific name, correct it in the italic form* **Suggested title: Advances in Cell Therapy Using Rabbit Models for Regenerative Medicine** **Suggestions for Improvement in abstract part:** **1. For example, instead of:** Of the articles found, those that deviated from the topic or did not address the use of rabbits in cell therapy were excluded, **consider adding details like:** "After an initial retrieval of X articles, those that did not specifically address the use of rabbits in cell therapy or were unrelated to the scope of this review were excluded. This resulted in a final selection of Y articles."* **2. Descriptors Clarification:** You used descriptors like “Cell therapy and experimentation in rabbits” and “rabbits and cell therapy.” Were these exact search terms used, or were Medical Subject Headings (MeSH terms) applied? Clarifying this will add credibility to your methodology. **4.Broader View of the Field:** The phrase “The present work presents a broad and distinct view of cell therapy...” is somewhat vague. It could be more effective to specify what aspects are being presented—e.g., applications in specific diseases, mechanisms of action, or a comparison of animal models. This will give readers a clearer sense of what to expect. **6. Advantages of Rabbit Model:** You mention that the work presents "a promising framework for animal experimentation in rabbits, and the advantages of using this animal model." This is a strong point, but it might benefit from examples or explanations about the specific advantages of rabbits (e.g., size, physiology, cost). Adding this will underscore the importance of the rabbit model in the context of cell therapy**.** **7. Linguistic Refinement:** **- Minor edits can improve readability:** **- "**Of the articles found... could be revised to: "After screening the retrieved articles..." - "addressed the topic"* can be more specific by stating which aspects of the topic are covered**.** **Suggestions for Improvement in the introduction part:** **1. Suggested Revision:** Cell therapy, a cornerstone of regenerative medicine, has revolutionized the treatment of numerous debilitating conditions by harnessing the body's ability to heal itself through the	

	use of living cells. **2. Suggested Revision:** Animal experimentation, particularly in rabbits, has been instrumental in advancing cell therapy research due to their physiological and biological similarities to humans, particularly in cardiovascular and musculoskeletal systems. **3. Suggested Edit:** Combine the second and third paragraphs, emphasizing rabbits as an experimental model earlier. **4. Suggested Revision**: Cell therapy can be broadly classified into autologous, using cells from the patient, and allogenic, using donor-derived cells. Autologous therapies offer reduced immune rejection risks, while allogenic therapies present new opportunities in cases where the patient's cells are unsuitable. **5. Suggested Addition**: Rabbits are a cost-effective and practical model due to their size and similarities in tissue structure, making them ideal for preclinical studies in regenerative medicine." **6. Suggested Edit:** "Rabbits have long served as a suitable experimental model due to their broad physiological similarities to humans, making them an excellent choice for tissue regeneration studies." **7. Suggested Addition:** While animal models like rabbits provide valuable insights, challenges remain in translating these findings into clinical practice." **8. Suggested Edit:** In light of these advances, this manuscript aims to provide a comprehensive review of the literature on the application, effectiveness, and challenges of cell therapy in rabbit models. Your methodology section for the literature review is clear and concise, but as a reviewer, I would suggest some improvements to enhance its quality and clarity. **Suggestions for Improvement in the methodology part:** **1. Suggested Addition:** "Exclusion criteria included studies focusing on animals other than rabbits, non-English or non-Portuguese articles, studies published before 2019, and articles lacking sufficient data on cell therapy." **2. Suggested Addition**: "A combination of relevant keywords such as 'cell transplantation,' 'stem cells in rabbits,' 'regenerative medicine in animal models,' and 'preclinical trials in rabbits' were also considered to ensure a comprehensive search." **3. Suggested Addition:** "Full-text articles were thoroughly reviewed for relevance, quality, and study design, ensuring that they met the criteria for being either preclinical or clinical trials specifically involving cell therapy in rabbits." **4. Suggested Addition**: Figure 1 illustrates the selection process, showing the initial number of articles retrieved, the number excluded based on reading titles and abstracts, and the final number of studies included for review after full-text analysis." **5. Suggested Addition:** "The time frame of 2019–2024 was selected to focus on the most current advancements in cell therapy, reflecting the latest experimental models and therapeutic approaches in regenerative medicine." **6. Suggested Addition:** "Studies were categorized based on their design: clinical trials were those directly involving human subjects, while preclinical trials focused on animal models, specifically rabbits, used to investigate the effectiveness of cell therapies." **7. Suggested Addition:** "One limitation of the study is its reliance on PubMed and Science Direct, which may exclude relevant research published in other databases. Additionally, while efforts were	

	made to minimize selection bias, subjective interpretation during the screening process may have introduced bias." **Suggestions for Improvement in the result and discussion part:** **1. Suggested Revision:** Group related studies and interventions together under subheadings to allow readers to follow the discussion more easily. This would help emphasize key findings more clearly within each domain of therapy. **2. Suggested Addition**: Include a table summarizing studies like Zolocinska's, Rodrigues', Khanmohammadi's, etc., with columns for study focus, methodology, outcomes, and limitations. This could visually complement the narrative and offer a quick reference for readers. **3. Suggested Addition:** Expand on the biological mechanisms involved in the success of therapies, such as the differentiation potential of MSCs, their paracrine effects, and immune-modulatory properties, with more citations that explore these mechanisms in rabbit models. **4. Suggested Revision**: Include more discussion on gaps in the literature, conflicting data, or areas where further research is urgently needed. This would add depth to the critical evaluation of the field. **5. Suggested Addition:** Include a section on the ethical challenges involved in conducting cell therapy research in animal models like rabbits, including animal welfare, regulatory concerns, and the translational implications for human medicine. **6. Suggested Addition:** Explicitly state how the results from rabbit models are informing current human trials and how these findings might accelerate therapeutic advances in regenerative medicine.	

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Muhammad Bilawal**
Department, University & Country	**Sindh Agriculture University, Pakistan**