

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126798
Title of the Manuscript:	Current Trends in Vaccine Development: Perspectives from India and International Research
Type of the Article	Review Article

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 title of the manuscript is interesting and important for the scientific community. Dealing with this topic is very interesting and exciting and has a high scientific level and also is acceptable to the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title needs to be revised as following: A Review of Emerging Trends in Vaccine Development: Insights from India and Global Research	
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.	The abstract section is not coherent and should be corrected.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
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.	The manuscript is scientifically acceptable.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	It is better to use newer references.	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>There are a few grammatical errors and typos scattered throughout the text (e.g., “the Indian biotech and vaccine industry, benefiting from government support and public-private partnerships,...” could be clearer with proper punctuation). A thorough proofreading pass would improve professionalism.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This article is ready to be published in this journal after major revision. Here are some mistakes and areas for improvement in the article:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redundancy and Repetition: The article sometimes repeats the same ideas or phrases in different sections. For example, the importance of India's role in vaccine production has been mentioned several times without adding any new information. Simplifying these sections can increase readability. • Technical language: Some sections may be too technical for a general audience. Simplifying some scientific terms or accompanying them with explanations makes it more accessible. • Lack of a coherent narrative: Each section discusses a different vaccine technology, but sometimes lacks a clear connection to the broader narrative of vaccine development in the context of global health security and pandemic preparedness. Stronger bonding of parts increases cohesion. • Inconsistent Use of Terminology: This article sometimes uses different terms (for example, calls mRNA vaccines "new" while elsewhere stating that they are "well established") that can confuse the reader about the current state of these technologies. • Overemphasis on Indian contributions: While India's role in vaccine development is significant; the article could balance the discussion by providing more contexts on the contributions of other countries and international organizations to provide a global overview. • Future directions: Sections discussing future vaccine innovations and challenges may benefit from a more structured approach. Incorporating subheadings or bullet points can clarify this important information. • Data and statistics: When discussing the impact of vaccines, the article cites several high-level statistics (e.g., "India accounts for approximately 26% of the global burden of TB") without context or recent data. The inclusion of more contemporary statistics and comparisons strengthens the arguments. 	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Arezoo Esmaili</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Islamic Azad University, Iran</p>

Review Form 3