

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_120581
Title of the Manuscript:	IMMUNOGENIC PROTEINS CHARACTERIZATION IN THE LARVAE OF OESTRUS OVIS BY WESTERN BLOT ANALYSIS
Type of the Article	

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>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript highlights the identification of 19 immunoactive polypeptides in the larvae of <i>Oestrus ovis</i> . However, the authors minimally describe the applications of their findings and barely relate their work to other research done within a similar context. Despite the challenge of combating myiasis (a parasitic disease caused by the nasal blot fly larvae), the potential use of these identified polypeptides was not well described and related to similar findings in the literature. Furthermore the future implications were quite brief and could be more detailed in the next version.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is suitable, please add the common name along with the scientific name.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract reads like a methods section. First state why this study is important, then the aims, then briefly mention the methods, results, and conclusions. Also, you can use the common name after the first use of the scientific name. I recommend having a native speaker check the English and formatting of sentences throughout the MS. The last sentence in the abstract should be placed at the beginning.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No, the structure does not follow the proper subsections. There are results in the discussion section and general lack of discussion. The introduction could also be elongated.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	While the methods do follow a proper experimental science, the lack of discussion and relationship of the results within the context of other works demonstrates limited scientific rigor. This needs to be addressed first. Additionally, the figures need to be described with more scientific detail in their respective captions. The results section with listed numbers could be more clearly expressed by using a table. Lastly, state the relevance of the figures in the results section.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	No, the manuscript lacks references, 9 references total would not even be sufficient for a short communication. There should be at the very least 20 references. Please do more research on the topic and discuss in the 'discussion' section how this work relates to other findings and studies.	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	No, the English should be addressed and use of tenses, gerunds, and prepositions should be correct. Additionally, the scientific name <i>Oestrus ovis</i> was not italicized in the ethical section of the methods. The scientific name is also unnecessarily used throughout the manuscript, I recommend sticking with the common name.	
Optional/General comments	This does not seem like a final version of the manuscript as there are many English errors, formatting issues, lack of detail, incorrectly placing methods/results in the discussion section. Lack of explanations for the figures and general irrelevance to other studies and further implications of the work.	

Review Form 3

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:	Zachary Dellacqua
Department, University & Country	University of Rome 'Tor Vergata', Italy