

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 <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>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript brings valuable insights by highlighting reptiles as underexplored experimental models, offering potential in drug development and disease research. However, it lacks detailed comparisons with traditional models like rodents, which could help emphasize the advantages or limitations of using reptiles. Additionally, some sections could benefit from a more in-depth discussion of the challenges in applying these models, such as ethical concerns or practical limitations in experimental setups. Overall, it offers important contributions but would be stronger with more comprehensive analysis.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Experimental Models in Reptiles and Their Applications in Health," is clear but could be more specific and engaging. A more compelling alternative could be: "Reptiles as Experimental Models: Uncovering Their Role in Drug Development and Health Research"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract provides a solid overview of the article's main points, such as the importance of reptiles as experimental models and their applications in health research. However, there are areas where improvements could enhance its clarity and depth:</p> <p>Suggested Additions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clarify the relevance: The abstract could benefit from mentioning why reptiles, in particular, are valuable compared to other animal models. This would strengthen the rationale for the study. 2. Highlight specific findings: Including a brief mention of key examples, like the cardiovascular studies on rattlesnakes or hormonal research in geckos, would provide concrete evidence of the manuscript's contributions. <p>Suggested Deletions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General statements: Some vague phrases like "various applications" could be removed or replaced with specific examples to make the abstract more informative. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate, as they follow a logical progression from introduction to methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion. Incorporating tables or figures, especially in the Results section, could help convey complex data more effectively and improve reader engagement.</p>	
<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>Here are the points regarding the scientific correctness of the manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Literature Review: The manuscript presents a thorough review of relevant studies from 2019 to 2024, ensuring that the information is current and reflects recent advancements in the field. • Ethical Considerations: It emphasizes adherence to ethical principles in animal research, particularly the Three Rs (reduction, replacement, refinement), which enhances the manuscript's credibility and responsible scientific practice. • Relevance of Reptile Physiology: The discussion highlights various reptile species and their physiological characteristics, demonstrating a solid understanding of comparative biology and supporting their use as experimental models for human health. • Sound Methodology: The outlined methodology for selecting studies and conducting the review process contributes to the transparency and replicability of the research, reinforcing the technical soundness of the manuscript. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references in the manuscript are generally sufficient and recent, covering studies from 2019 to 2024. However, including additional references from prominent journals in veterinary science or animal model research could enhance the manuscript's credibility</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, some sentences could be streamlined for improved readability and flow. Minor grammatical corrections and refinements in phrasing could enhance the overall quality and clarity, ensuring that the manuscript meets high academic standards.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript provides a valuable exploration of reptiles as experimental models, emphasizing their potential in health research. It effectively highlights ethical considerations and the importance of animal welfare. However, enhancing clarity through concise language and addressing minor grammatical issues would improve readability. Additionally, expanding the reference list to include more recent studies could strengthen the manuscript further. Overall, it contributes significantly to the understanding of reptile models in scientific research.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shoebul Haque
Department, University & Country	King George's Medical University, India