

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_127471
Title of the Manuscript:	Immune characterization of human pneumotropic local serotype 1 and 6 Staphylococcus pneumoniae isolates as local vaccine strains
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: 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>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This work not only enriches the understanding of pneumococcal immunology but also sets the stage for innovative approaches to combatting pneumotropic infections effectively.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Immunogenic Properties of Local Serotypes C1 and C6 of <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> in Vaccine Formulation	
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.	Suggestion: Clarity, methods and findings should be more clear Deletions: Repetition, technical jargon, numerical clarity required	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	detailed statistical analyses of the results (e.g., efficacy percentages) should be included in the full manuscript to validate the claims. It is essential to discuss potential limitations, such as strain variability or the scope of immune responses, to ensure a balanced interpretation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	<input type="checkbox"/> There are grammatical errors, such as "Capsules were separated, identified , quantified," which should read "Capsules were separated, identified, and quantified." <input type="checkbox"/> Some sentences are overly long and lack proper punctuation, making them difficult to follow. For example, "The immune primed rabbits left for 28 days then test bleed to check for an evident immune conversion" should be rephrased for clarity and correctness. <input type="checkbox"/> Phrases like "test bleed" and "immune priming of rabbits" could be replaced with "blood sampling" and "immunization of rabbits," respectively, to align with scholarly language. <input type="checkbox"/> "1 x 10 to six CFU/ml" should be written as "1 × 10 ⁶ CFU/ml" for proper scientific notation. Terms like "proinflammatory cytokine responses" and "anti-inflammatory cytokine" are used correctly but need to be consistent throughout.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes. Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arfa Shahzad
Department, University & Country	UVAS, Pakistan