

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 manuscript highlights the significance of region-specific pneumococcal vaccines by characterizing serotypes 1 and 6 <i>S. pneumoniae</i> . It provides valuable data on immune efficacy, systemic and mucosal responses, and cytokine dynamics. These findings contribute to advancing targeted immunization strategies, addressing gaps in global vaccines, and combating pneumococcal diseases in resource-limited regions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes. It is relevant and suitable	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive but can be improved by briefly explaining the rationale for selecting serotypes 1 and 6 and summarizing key methods, such as rabbit immunization and immune response evaluation. Simplify findings by avoiding detailed numerical data and ensure a structured flow: context, methods, results, and conclusion for clarity.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript is scientifically correct, with a solid experimental design using rabbit models to assess immune responses to <i>S. pneumoniae</i> serotypes 1 and 6. It effectively evaluates purity, safety, antigenicity, and immune efficacy.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are relevant but could benefit from recent studies on pneumococcal vaccine development, particularly multiserotype vaccines and immune responses in animal models. Including newer reviews and studies from the past 3-5 years would strengthen the manuscript and align it with current research trends in pneumococcal immunization.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
<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:	Lavanya Balaji
Department, University & Country	Saveetha University, India