

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Archives of Current Research International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ACRI_125336</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>The Use of Primates as Experimental Models in Scientific Research and Its Ethical Implications</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Minireview Article</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript does a fine job in condensing 12 articles that have been released in the past five years that cover the topics of primates in scientific research, therapies in primates, ethical issues, the promotion of animal welfare, and legal protection. This thereby provides a good basis for anyone who wishes to update themselves in these fields to become familiar with recent development. However, due to its limited focus on papers released in the last five years and to those covering the discussed five topics results in a manuscript that reaches widely but not deeply.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>In the third sentence it would be wise to put what kind of significant investments are required e.g., financial, temporal, equipment etc.</p> <p>You state research with primate models involves advantages and disadvantages, however this is very vague. Including more specificity here would help the reader know exactly what you are communicating.</p> <p>Overall, the abstract communicates clearly that the researcher is highlighting how non-human primates use in scientific studies can be a benefit for scientific understanding, but this comes with ethical considerations.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>The subsections are appropriate.</p> <p>It appears that multiple paragraphs have been split apart to form two vastly smaller paragraphs. I advise that the author(s) go through their manuscript and see where paragraphs could be combined to aid in readability (see other comments for examples).</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript is collating recent research and then relaying that information in the form of a review article. They perform some basic descriptive statistics, but the majority of the article takes a historiographical format, looking at the progress of five specific topics in relation to primate research within the last five years. Overall, the author(s) need to better explain their methodology, giving clearer detail in their inclusion criteria / methodology. They also need to better show the results of their literature search in relation to their inclusion / exclusion criteria. I have suggested a flow chart as I believe this would visually work well. The results section of their manuscript is well written. Although, the section on legal protection is vague and needs more detail.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :</p>	<p>All references are recent, and many appear to be from their literature review search. However, this is not made apparent in the manuscript. I have suggested a table for the analysed articles as this would allow readers to cross-validate these articles with the references used.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The methodology section needs work to increase the clarity of what the author is trying to communicate. The section on why certain articles were included or excluded needs particular work.</p> <p>Check throughout the manuscript that 'The review' or 'This review' are used correctly with the right tense.</p>	
<p><b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments</p>	<p>You state that 'animal models requires substantial investments in financial and labor resources', while this may be true, it would be wise to include a study that shows what you are stating.</p> <p>I think the opening paragraphs seem split after 'resources' and before 'Moreover, their use is limited by'. These would read better when combined into a single paragraph.</p> <p>The first paragraph in the methodology could perhaps be better represented in a flow chart as this would allow the reader to at a glance know where articles were found, using what search terms and from where the analysed articles were found.</p> <p>In the methodology section you state you used 'search terms such as' "experimental model in primates," "primates in scientific research," "diseases in primate experimental models," and "laboratory primate welfare." 'were these the only search terms used or the total amount? Consider revising if you used more, if not revise the sentence to read that these were the search terms used.</p> <p>It would be wise to rephrase this section as it does not read clearly 'This review focused on the inclusion criteria for articles, with titles and abstracts related to the following research topics: Primates in scientific research, Therapies in primates, Ethical issues and promotion of animal welfare, and Legal protection.'</p> <p>It is difficult to determine why only five articles were included for analyses when you found hundreds of articles from multiple sources. Was it that only articles that included coverd of the subjects (Primates in scientific research, Therapies in primates, Ethical issues and promotion of animal welfare, and Legal protection) in a single paper were included?</p> <p>You state twice that 12 articles were analysed but you do not state what these articles are. A table of these analysed articles and their focus would be useful to readers.</p> <p>In the methodology section you state that 'findings from the literature were evaluated' but you neglect to state by what measure these findings are evaluated by.</p> <p>Table 1 is not cited in the text.</p> <p>In the results section of table 1, how have you managed to find a thousandth of a research theme (e.g., 402.111)? Consider using a comma to avoid confusion if it is meant to be 402,111.</p> <p>Section 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 are all well written and thus easy to understand.</p> <p>In section 3.3. you state 'there is significant variation among countries in the practical implementation of this principle', I think providing some examples would better help elucidate this point.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**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>Samuel Richardson</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University of Birmingham, United Kingdom</b>