

**Review Form 3**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <b>Asian Journal of Immunology</b>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_AJI_123549</b>  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>A brief overview on antigens: Properties, classes and mode of action</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <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><b>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.</b></p>                        | <p>The manuscript presents a thorough overview of antigens, including their properties, classes, and modes of action. It is particularly valuable for the scientific community as it highlights various critical aspects of antigenic behavior and their implications for immunology, vaccine development, and autoimmune diseases. The manuscript's clear categorization of antigens and their immunogenic properties makes it an important reference for students and professionals in the field of immunology.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>  | <p>The title, "A brief overview on antigens: Properties classes and mode of action," is fairly descriptive of the content, but could be refined for clarity. A suggestion for improvement might be: "An Overview of Antigen Properties, Classifications, and Mechanisms of Action."</p>   |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p>   | <p>The abstract adequately summarizes the core content of the manuscript, but it could be more concise. There is a slight redundancy in repeating that antigens trigger immune responses, which could be streamlined. I recommend removing some repetitive points and emphasizing the uniqueness of the review more strongly. Additionally, consider introducing a sentence that mentions the practical applications of understanding antigens in diagnostics and vaccine development.</p>                            |   |
| <p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>  | <p>The subsections are well-organized and logically ordered, making it easy for readers to follow. The flow from the introduction to the properties, structure, and types of antigens is smooth. There are no major structural issues with the manuscript.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>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.</b></p> | <p>The manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound. It correctly outlines fundamental immunological principles, including antigenicity, specificity, and the role of antigens in immune responses. Furthermore, the inclusion of real-world examples such as blood group antigens and bacterial capsules helps to reinforce the technical discussion with practical examples. The references to primary literature are appropriate, contributing to its scientific credibility.</p>                |   |
| <p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b><br/>:</p>   | <p>The references seem sufficient and relevant to the topic. The inclusion of recent sources like those from 2019 and 2020 adds to the manuscript's relevance. However, the manuscript could benefit from a few more current references, particularly in the section discussing the application of antigens in modern immunology and diagnostics.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>Title: Consider a slightly more precise and engaging title.<br/>References: Add more recent literature, especially post-2020, to update the review in terms of contemporary immunological advances.<br/>Language: A light editing for grammar and flow could enhance readability.</p> <p>It provides a solid foundation of knowledge, but could benefit from tighter editing and additional recent references.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>   | <p>No apparent ethical issues arise from this manuscript as it is a review article that synthesizes existing literature.</p> <p>There do not appear to be any competing interests present in the manuscript.</p> <p>Based on a preliminary review of the manuscript, there are no clear indications of plagiarism. However, a more thorough analysis using plagiarism detection tools is recommended.</p>   |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <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>Usama Ahmed</b>                    |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Shenzhen University, P.R China</b> |