

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_125076
Title of the Manuscript:	Experimental Models in Reptiles and Their Applications in Health
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>

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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript is of great importance in reference to correlate its application to human health. 2. The related content provided is not sufficient. 3. Some detail study should be done although by considering only one related factor. 	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is good.	
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.	Abstract is not similar with outcomes completely, There is no brief description of the applications of studying reptiles as experimental models in abstract. Kindly match it with outcomes of the study.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It's Ok.	
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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the development in scientific research related to human health, such studies should be carried out. 2. As directly we cannot apply any experiment or drug trial on human, so detail physiological study of experimental models have great importance. 3. By compiling the all research done so far on experimental models can guide researchers to carry out new applications and its consequences. 	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	According to the title, some more detailed study is required, for which more research papers are required to be followed.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language is ok, but sentences are too long. Kindly simplify them and make them easy to understand.	
Optional/General comments	Introduction is just repeating the same concept again and again that research is beneficial for human. It should be reconstructed.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mamta Devi Sharma
Department, University & Country	Shoolini Institute of Life Sciences and Business Management, India