

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.	The manuscript covers an important point that many have not addressed. There is not enough data and research about it.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title should be modified (Here are some suggestions): Reptiles as experimental models and their applications in health (or research) Or/ Reptiles as experimental models: their implementation in research and improving health.	
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.	Good Reptiles word should be added as a keyword	
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.	Every section of the manuscript was representative and directly forward. However, some suggestions that would improve the quality of the manuscript were mentioned in the last item of the table.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Here are some suggestions: The abstract: the production of medicines and vaccines The introduction: To better understand experimental models in in vivo research reptiles hold an important position among vertebrates for (in) investigating the evolution The methodology: eight stages, defined as: The results and discussion: as fundamental aspects for (of) ethical procedures	
Optional/General comments	The authors haven't mentioned even a simple scientific classification or taxonomy regarding the reptiles mentioned: Please add a simple classification of reptiles used. The authors haven't mentioned the general features that allowed reptiles to be accepted as animal models The review is about health but mentioning that reptiles have been used in other fields would be beneficial in the introduction section. Please avoid repeating paragraphs with the same point of view in the introduction section(the first three paragraphs).	

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:	Mennat-Elrahman Ahmed Fahmy
Department, University & Country	Theodor Bilharz Research Institute, Egypt