

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_103014
Title of the Manuscript:	Immune Responses to Hepatitis B Vaccine in Type 2 Diabetic Patients
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalaji.com/index.php/AJI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. No 6. Yes</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The information given into the manuscript is good and informative scientifically. However there are some suggestions to do in order to make the manuscript more attractive and informative.</p> <p>Abstract: The aim of the study, should be include in the background</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ I suggest you to organize your introduction with paragraph in order to make the reading easily for the reader. Write it with four paragraph in maximum. ➤ Avoid unnecessarily long paragraphs. Break up your paragraphs into smaller, useful units; ➤ The 1st paragraph should contain the general background of the topic; ➤ The 2nd and 3rd paragraphs should discuss previous works related to the topic; ➤ The last paragraph should Point out issues that are being addressed about the problem and the purpose of the present work. <p>Materials & Methods: Change the heading with Materials & Methods I suggest you to organize it with the following paragraphs with subheading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Study design, sampling and population ➤ Criteria for inclusion and exclusion ➤ Data collection ➤ Biological and clinical diagnosis ➤ Ethical consideration ➤ Statistical analysis <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Make sure your graphs and tables can speak for themselves 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ You should organize this section with subheading and do not repeat in words everything that your tables and graphs convey. You can, however, point out key findings and offer some text that complements the findings; ➤ You should bring back all tables and figures to below their respective paragraphs from the Results section. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ I suggest you to organize your Discussion section with paragraph in order to make the reading easily for the reader. ➤ Make sure that your discussion is concise and informative. Do not ramble and include a great deal of unnecessary information that will likely get your paper rejected or at least be looked upon less favorably; ➤ The order of figures and tables should follow the discussion themes and not the sequence they were conducted; ➤ Your discussion section should answer why you obtained the observed results and also why your results are important. Do not simply restate the results. Highlight how your research contributes to the current knowledge in the field and mention the next steps or what remains. Feel free to explain why your results falsify current theories if that is the case; ➤ Discuss how your data compare with previous results and do not forget to indicate their references with number into the text; 	
--	--	--

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:	Ndoe Guiaro Marcellin
Department, University & Country	Centre for Research on Health and Priority Pathologies, Institute of Medical Research and Medicinal Plants Studies, Cameroon