

### 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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript holds significant importance for the scientific community as it addresses the pressing need for localized pneumococcal vaccines tailored to the immunogenic and pathogenic profiles of regional serotypes. By focusing on serotypes 1 and 6, the study provides valuable insights into the immune characteristics of these isolates, potentially bridging gaps in global vaccine coverage where current formulations may fall short.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	"Immune Characterization of Local Serotype 1 and 6 <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> Isolates as Potential Vaccine Candidates" 1. Misidentification of the species name (The correct name is <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> , not <i>Staphylococcus pneumoniae</i> ) 2. The title does not clearly convey the focus on carbohydrate-based prototype vaccines	
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 provides a general overview of the study but lacks comprehensiveness and clarity in key areas. Here are some suggestions for improvement: 1. Include a more specific and concise description of the study's primary objective 2. Briefly describe the experimental approach, including the use of rabbits, the vaccine formulation, and key assays performed 3. Summarize critical findings with numerical values, such as immune efficacy percentages and cytokine response differences, for a more impactful presentation 4. Words like "pure, safe, antigenic, immunogenic" are repeated unnecessarily	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	1. The manuscript incorrectly refers to <i>Staphylococcus pneumoniae</i> instead of <i>Streptococcus pneumoniae</i> , which is a major scientific error. 2. The study lacks details on statistical methods used to analyze differences in immune responses, cytokine levels, and survival rates. 3. The manuscript does not compare the immune efficacy of the prototypes with approved pneumococcal vaccines (e.g., PCV13 or PPSV23). 4. The study focuses exclusively on local isolates without examining how findings might translate to other serotypes or regions.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript cites 20 references, many of which are relevant to the study's focus on vaccine development and immune responses. A few recent references (e.g., 2022 publications) are included, but the majority are older, with some dating back to 2001 and earlier. The references heavily rely on the authors' prior publications (e.g., [10], [13]).	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript's language quality is <b>not yet suitable</b> for scholarly communication. Substantial revisions are required to address grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and technical jargon. A professional language editor or native English speaker with expertise in scientific writing is recommended for thorough editing.	
Optional/General comments	<b>Insufficient Ethical Details:</b> The ethical considerations section mentions compliance with international standards but does not provide details of ethical approvals or protocols. The manuscript does not explicitly address potential competing interests, which is a critical omission in scholarly communication. There is no evidence of plagiarism.	

#### 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pritam Pal
Department, University & Country	ICAR- National Dairy Research Institute, India