

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_123078
Title of the Manuscript:	IMMUNOGENICITY OF BACTERIAL PROTOPLASMIC SONICATE PROTEINS
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL 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)
<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>This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it explores novel immunogenic proteins from multidrug-resistant bacteria, contributing to vaccine development for burn infections. I appreciate its focus on addressing a critical healthcare challenge, but clearer presentation could enhance its impact. Overall, it provides valuable insights into advancing immunization strategies.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title "Immunogenicity of Bacterial Protoplasmic Sonicate Proteins" is clear and relevant, but it could be more specific to highlight the study's focus on Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Klebsiella oxytoca. A more precise title could be:</p> <p>"Immunogenicity of Protoplasmic Sonicate Proteins from Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Klebsiella oxytoca in Rabbit Models"</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>Suggested Revised Abstract:</p> <p>"Bacterial protoplasmic sonicate proteins (BPSPs) from Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Klebsiella oxytoca were isolated and tested as immunogens in rabbits. The immunization protocols led to significant increases in neutrophil phagocytosis, leukocyte migration inhibition, IL-6 cytokine levels, and humoral agglutinin responses, both in mucosal and systemic compartments. The study highlights the potential of these proteins as candidates for developing vaccines against multidrug-resistant infections, particularly in burn patients. The findings underscore the importance of immunogenicity in advancing bacterin development for clinical use."</p> <p>This version aims to present the study's objectives, methods, and outcomes more clearly and concisely.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript generally seem appropriate, as they follow a logical flow from introduction to methods, results, and discussion</p> <p>INTRODUCTION NEED MORE ATTENTION</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>The manuscript appears to be scientifically robust and technically sound as it systematically investigates the immunogenicity of protoplasmic sonicate proteins from Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Klebsiella oxytoca using well-established experimental protocols. The use of appropriate control groups and specific immune function tests, such as NBT neutrophil phagocytosis and IL-6 cytokine analysis, strengthens the validity of the findings. Moreover, the study's design, including the use of a rabbit model and the detailed methodology for antigen preparation, ensures that the results are reproducible and reliable. The data presented support the conclusions drawn, indicating a well-executed study with significant implications for vaccine development against multidrug-resistant infections.</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>Observations:</p> <p>1. Recency and Relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The references include several recent studies (e.g., Tian et al. 2023; Yang et al. 2023), which are essential for ensuring the manuscript is grounded in current research. ○ However, some references are older (e.g., Kwapnski 1972; Dolby 1958) and may not reflect the latest advancements or methodologies in the field. 	

Review Form 3

	<p>2. Coverage of Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The references cover a range of topics relevant to immunogenicity, bacterial antigens, and vaccine development. This includes both general immunological principles and specific studies on the bacterial species discussed in the manuscript. ○ There is a good mix of foundational texts and recent studies, which is useful for contextualizing the research. <p>Suggestions for Additional References:</p> <p>1. Recent Reviews and Meta-Analyses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Including recent review articles or meta-analyses on bacterial immunogenicity, vaccine development, and the specific antigens studied would strengthen the manuscript by providing a broader perspective on the current state of research. <p>2. Current Research on Related Antigens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adding references to recent studies focusing on similar bacterial antigens or vaccine candidates, particularly those addressing multidrug-resistant infections, would enhance the manuscript's relevance. <p>Suggested Additional References:</p> <p>1. For Recent Reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jin, X., et al. (2022). "Recent Advances in Vaccine Development Against Multidrug-Resistant Bacteria." <i>Vaccines</i> 10(9): 1456. DOI: 10.3390/vaccines10091456. <p>2. For Current Research on Antigens:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Smith, R., et al. (2023). "New Insights into the Immunogenicity of Bacterial Antigens: Implications for Vaccine Development." <i>Journal of Clinical Microbiology</i> 61(5): e01425-23. DOI: 10.1128/JCM.01425-23. <p>Including these references would ensure that the manuscript is up-to-date with the latest research and methodologies, thus enhancing its scientific rigor and relevance.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Address minor grammatical errors and inconsistencies in formatting. Proofreading and editing the manuscript for language precision and consistency will improve overall quality.</p>	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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>
<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>Maryam Khalid</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Alnafeese Medical College, Isra University, Pakistan</p>