

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Immunology</a>
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: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	S. pneumoniae is a very important pathogen. Any new development towards vaccine prevention is important. This article brings such development from a geographical area less researched.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title says Staphylococcus pneumoniae which should be corrected as Streptococcus	
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.	"antigenic,immunogenic and immune protective to the rat of 80% for C1 and 60% for C6 serotype" This should be corrected as rabbit It is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	The researches have followed development and testing in animal model. Response is measured. Difficult to get research on this practical aspect.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	LaFon DC, Nahm MH. Measuring immune responses to pneumococcal vaccines. J Immunol Methods. 2018 Oct;461:37-43. doi: 10.1016/j.jim.2018.08.002. Epub 2018 Aug 8. PMID: 30098317; PMCID: PMC6169307.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	Multiple language errors are noted. These interfere with reading this article. Need to correct	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The work is difficult to follow due to language errors but research is shedding some information on vaccine development. Would like to know whether clinical isolates mean blood or CSF isolates. Sputum is not a good sample for invasive Pneumococci	

#### PART 2:

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Namage Shirani Chandrasiri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Colombo South Teaching Hospital, Sri Lanka</b>