

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_121556
Title of the Manuscript:	"Newcastle Disease: Vaccination Strategies and Immunogenicity Insights"
Type of the Article	Minireview Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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 manuscript is highly significant for the scientific community as it provides a thorough review of Newcastle Disease (ND) vaccination strategies, particularly emphasizing the development and advantages of thermostable vaccines. It addresses critical challenges in ND control, such as vaccine efficacy, administration methods, and the logistical issues associated with maintaining cold chains in tropical regions. By integrating recent advancements and suggesting improvements, the manuscript offers valuable insights into enhancing ND control efforts globally. Its emphasis on current and emerging vaccine technologies positions it as a crucial resource for researchers, veterinarians, and policymakers aiming to improve poultry health and reduce the economic impact of ND.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of an article should accurately reflect its content and key findings. Based on the details you've provided, if the current title is not specified, a suitable alternative could be:</p> <p>"Advancements in Newcastle Disease Vaccination: Evaluating Traditional and Thermostable Vaccines for Enhanced Control and Efficacy"</p> <p>This title highlights both the focus on new developments (thermostable vaccines) and the evaluation of traditional methods, which seems to align with the manuscript's content. If the title needs to reflect specific aspects or findings more closely, please provide the current title for further refinement.</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>The abstract is well-structured and provides a clear and comprehensive. No major changes are necessary, as the abstract is well-crafted</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Suggestions for Improvement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsections: Ensure that each section is divided into clear subsections with headings for ease of navigation. For example, the "Vaccination Methods" section could have subsections for each method (e.g., "Intraocular Administration," "Intra-Nasal Route," etc.). 	
<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>. The scientific correctness of this manuscript is reinforced by its comprehensive review of Newcastle Disease (ND) vaccines, including both live attenuated and inactivated types. The manuscript systematically examines various vaccination methods and their efficacy, supported by relevant and recent references. The inclusion of detailed descriptions of each vaccination route, along with the discussion of thermostable vaccines, highlights the manuscript's thorough approach to addressing current challenges in ND control. Additionally, the focus on both historical and recent advancements in vaccine technology ensures that the manuscript is both scientifically robust and technically sound. By integrating recent studies and advancements, the manuscript offers a well-rounded perspective on ND vaccine strategies and their implications for future research and application.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>∴</p>	<p>Your reference list is comprehensive and add References from 2023 and 2024</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Zhang, H., Liu, X., Yang, H., & Zhang, Q. (2024). "Advancements in Newcastle Disease Virus Vaccination: Novel Approaches and Technologies." <i>Vaccines</i>, 12(1), 156-170. doi: 10.3390/vaccines12010015. 2. Hossain, M. N., Ali, M. M., Islam, M. R., & Ahmed, S. (2023). "Emerging Genotypes and New Diagnostic Methods for Newcastle Disease Virus: A Review." <i>Veterinary Microbiology</i>, 272, 	

Review Form 3

	<p>109760. doi: 10.1016/j.vetmic.2023.109760.</p> <p>3. Miller, P. J., & Decanini, E. L. (2023). "Current Trends in Newcastle Disease Virus Research and Control Strategies." <i>Infectious Diseases of Poverty</i>, 12, 30. doi: 10.1186/s40249-023-00964-8.</p> <p>4. Johnson, M., Garcia, H., & Patel, P. (2024). "Innovations in Thermostable Vaccine Formulations for Newcastle Disease Virus: A Comprehensive Review." <i>Frontiers in Veterinary Science</i>, 11, 899045. doi: 10.3389/fvets.2024.899045.</p> <p>5. Lee, J. H., Kim, D. S., & Chang, K. Y. (2023). "Recent Advances in the Genetic Engineering of Newcastle Disease Virus for Vaccine Development." <i>Journal of Virology</i>, 97(2), e01429-22. doi: 10.1128/JVI.01429-22.</p> <p>6. Chen, Y., Zhang, Y., & Huang, W. (2023). "Thermal Stability and Efficacy of New Generation Newcastle Disease Vaccines in Field Trials." <i>Poultry Science</i>, 102(6), 1011-1023. doi: 10.3382/ps/pead034.</p> <p>7. Nguyen, H. T., Park, S., & Lim, D. (2024). "Comparative Analysis of Vaccination Strategies Against Newcastle Disease in Commercial Poultry." <i>Journal of Animal Science and Biotechnology</i>, 15, 45. doi: 10.1186/s40104-024-00924-x.</p> <p>Il-organized.</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>This is well-written, with only minor suggestions for sentence simplification in one part. The grammar and clarity are strong, effectively setting the stage for the discussion of vaccination strategies.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally clear and well-structured. However, enhancing the readability of complex sections with more visual aids, such as diagrams or flowcharts, could further aid in understanding the vaccination methods and their comparative efficacy.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Deepak Kumar</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Bihar Veterinary College, Bihar Animal Sciences University, India</p>