

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_113963
Title of the Manuscript:	THE INTELUEKINE -2 AND INTERLUEKINE -4 RESPONSE PROFILES IN PEDIATRIC BCG VACCINEE
Type of the Article	

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> <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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes the manuscript is important for the scientific community. BCG is a vaccine which is given to children for the protection of tuberculosis, which is one of infectious diseases which claims many lives. Therefore, understanding the immune response to the vaccine will provide valuable insights into the immune response and can help researchers to develop better vaccination strategies and improve its efficacy.</p> <p>The title is of the article is suitable</p> <p>The abstract needs to be beefed with figures showing the results</p> <p>The subsections and structure of manuscript is appropriate</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct</p> <p>Yes the references are sufficient and mostly recent.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where was this study done? Prevalence of TB in the population? Period of the study-when was the study done 2. Study design was not included in the manuscript 3. The sample size calculation is not clear. At what level the study is powered. 4. The sample selection needs to be included in the manuscript. Age of participants is missing in the paper 5. The authors do not give a clear description of the data analysis done 6. The Immune Herd normal distribution plots could best be presented as one figure of with four panels (1, 2, 3, and 4), representing cases (scar, non-scar and cumulative) and controls. 7. Conclusion: part of the conclusion was made on assumption, the study did not look at age of participants and BCG make up. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The quality of the English is poor and needs improvement. A lot of misspellings and typos, therefore the manuscript needs major editing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Interesting study which needs time to include all missing sections in the manuscript. Otherwise, it is a good start.</p>	

[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:	Kelita Kamoto
Department, University & Country	Malawi