

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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community Newcastle disease is a deadly viral infection that can affect any bird species, from chickens to parrots It is caused by virulent strains of avian paramyxovirus type 1. It usually presents as a respiratory disease, but depression, nervous manifestations, or diarrhoea may be the predominant clinical form.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative. It accurately reflects the content of the paper	
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.	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well organized and easy to follow. The subsections are logical and informative.	
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.	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. The authors also discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The authors cite a variety of relevant sources, including recent papers on Gated Recurrent Units and sentiment analysis.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	There are few correction for spelling mistake such as: Spelling mistake. change the citation to number style I mentioned all comments in the manuscript	

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

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shameeran Salman Ismael
Department, University & Country	College of Health Sciences, University of Duhok, Iraq