

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Original Manuscript_JAMB_117691
Title of the Manuscript:	Bio-computational prediction of novel epitopes on VP2 protein of infectious bursal disease virus
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.journaljamb.com/index.php/JAMB/editorial-policy>)

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes but has some lack clarity starting from title up to conclusions</p> <p>No the title should be clearly stated with place of study and type of study</p> <p>'Bio-computational prediction of novel epitopes on VP2 protein of infectious bursal disease virus in Bihar Animal Sciences University, india ' better to add type of study designe</p> <p>No. It lacks consicuetiveness in the aim part lacks or miss objective of study expected outcome from study did not mentioned. The abstract must be smart, clear, scientific ,mustbe written clearly and easily nderstandable and it included all findings figureatively with significant statistical result, the methodology part lacks consistency for example the author did not mention the specific location of the study area by now it is better to describe using map arc gis . study unit,sampling frame,sample size not clearly stated, consent form not mentioned. The gap of this study and limitation do not mentioned. Discussion paftr have vague did not clear aswell as lacks comparison of previous study with current experimental findings.</p> <p>Regarding references ;it should be includede the recent findings regarding IBD for instance in Ethiopia ,or other continets studied regarding IBD vaccine development with specific type of production and breed of chickens. So try to cover current studies published and clearly show the gap and the current findings of ur study and difference from other studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Needs paraphrasing	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	It is better to revised and correct the comments with clarifications,	

Review Form 1.7

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:	Henok Mulatu Metaferiya
Department, University & Country	Ethiopia