

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_124633
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>NEW PLASMID CONSTRUCTS FOR PRODUCTION OF YEAST BASED ORAL VACCINES</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>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.</p>	<p>The construction of plasmids for production of yeast-based oral vaccine as the title of this manuscript suggests is quite an interesting approach for vaccine development. However, after careful review of the manuscript, I find some critical concerns that must be addressed to enhance its quality.</p> <p>The methods used in this study are not robust enough to support the conclusions drawn from the findings. The introduction erroneously claims that Western blotting analysis was performed but the results section shows otherwise. The authors have simply designed the five expression plasmids using SnapGene software and performed virtual restriction digests and gel electrophoresis using same software. This level of <i>in silico</i> work is not sufficient to confirm the viability and functionality of the proposed plasmid constructs. This is a significant limitation of the manuscript.</p> <p>In my opinion, a wet lab-based experimental validation of the plasmid constructs is needed without which the study falls short for its claims. A wet-lab validation will reveal the true potential of these proposed plasmid constructs as a tool for producing chikungunya and dengue oral vaccines.</p> <p>I strongly recommend that the authors perform laboratory experiments to validate their plasmid constructs as this would enhance the study's contribution to the field of vaccine development.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>-</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>-</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>See comments above</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references contain a good number of old works. I recommend using published papers that are not more than 10 years old to ensure that information presented in the manuscript are not outdated or overtaken by current technologies.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ezinne Janefrances Nwonu</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Nigeria</b>