

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_113746
Title of the Manuscript:	Rational Design of a Multi-Epitope Vaccine for Yak Milk Allergy by Immuno-informatics approach
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, but incomplete methodology and approach, it requires to add more analyses to support their claim of vaccine design, I have added the comment in the manuscript for improvement, extra required analyses such MD simulations, population coverage, disulfide engineering, Ramachandran plot for 3D model validations, etc should be added in the manuscript.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Methodology and results section</p> <p>No, as there are contradictions between the methodology and results section</p> <p>No, need more references, references should be minimum 40-45, some suggested references are given at the end of the form.</p> <p>The idea is novel but the approach and methodology used in this research is lacking on several steps, I have just mentioned the technical steps that should be fulfilled for in-silico vaccine design, other than that author should improve the discussion section as the results and discussion section is combined, I haven't seen any discussion of the results. The discussion should compare their results with other studies and must tells the reader why the results are significant.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Need improvements	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p> <p>1. Improve the methodology and add full results</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Allah Rakha Yaseen</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Biological Sciences, University of the Punjab, Pakistan</b>