

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_129951
Title of the Manuscript:	PRECLINICAL IMMUNOGENICITY OF CAPSULE AND OUTERMEMBRANE PROTEINS OF A LOCAL NEUROTROPIC ISOLATE OF HEMOPHILUS INFLEUNZAE B IN A LAPIN MODEL
Type of the Article	

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 provides valuable insights into the immunogenicity of capsular and outer membrane proteins (OMP) of a local neurotropic <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i> type b (Hib) isolate in a rabbit model. The study's findings highlight the potential of these antigens as candidates for the development of both systemic and mucosal vaccines, which could be pivotal in preventing childhood meningitis caused by Hib. Furthermore, the research emphasizes the importance of local vaccine development tailored to region-specific isolates, addressing gaps in global vaccine efficacy and accessibility. Such advancements are essential for reducing the burden of Hib-related diseases, particularly in regions with limited access to effective vaccination programs.	OK
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable as it clearly conveys the study's focus.	OK
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.	While the abstract effectively outlines the study's scope, methods, and implications, it would however do better by including the following: The abstract should mentions the importance of <i>H. influenzae b</i> , it could briefly explain its global significance or disease burden. The specific goal of the study should be explicitly stated. Key Results (e.g., antibody fold increases) should be stated also.	Taken in consideration
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound and correct in its methodology and presentation of results. I am satisfied with it.	Thanks
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The manuscript includes a mix of references, some of which are recent, while others are quite dated. Although really old, classic references, such as Soberg (1969) and Catlin et al. (1972), are included to support well-established methods and foundational knowledge, this can be allowed, but a significant number of references used are just too old such as Shnawa et al., 1989; Burrell, 1979, while these may still hold value, relying heavily on older sources may weaken the perception of the study's alignment with current advancements. It is advisable to add more contemporary studies, particularly from the past 5–10 years, as this would strengthen the manuscript. Kindly correct the reference numbered 278 to 27 in the reference list.	This issue is explained within the text of the manuscript

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language of the article conveys the intended scientific content, but there are notable issues with grammar, sentence structure, and clarity that need to be addressed to meet the standards of scholarly communication.</p> <p>Please make corrections as follows:</p> <p>Search through the manuscript and correct H. Infleunzae to H. influenzae.</p> <p>Inconsistent formatting for units (e.g., mg/ml should be mg/mL).</p> <p>Please check for missing articles "a" and "the" in the manuscript.</p> <p>On abstract,</p> <p>Page 1, Line 2, correct <i>Hemophilus influenzae</i> b is gram negative ,short rods,encapsulated to <i>Haemophilus influenzae</i> b is a gram-negative, short rod-shaped, encapsulated bacterium.</p> <p>Page 1, Line 6, correct quantfied to quantified.</p> <p>Page 1, Line 9, correct invivo and speific to in vivo and specific</p> <p>Page 1, Line 18, correct immunogens stimulating humoral immune responses both at systemic and mucosal immune compartments to immunogens that stimulate humoral immune responses at both systemic and mucosal compartments.</p> <p>Introduction,</p> <p>Page 2, Line 3, correct fastiious to fastidious</p> <p>Page 2, Line 5, correct associate with human pyogenic respiratory and meningeal infections to is associated with human pyogenic respiratory and meningeal infections.</p> <p>Page 2, Line 10, correct charcterized to characterized.</p> <p>Page 2, Line 15, correct saporated to separated.</p> <p>Page 3, Line 4, correct appendroff tubes to Eppendorf tubes.</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Page 4, Line 5, correct sysyemic to systemic.</p> <p>Page 4, Line 9, correct mucosal globulin concentration was 4 both for anti-capsular and anti-OMP antibodies to the mucosal globulin concentration for both anti-capsular and anti-OMP antibodies was 4.</p> <p>Page 4, Line 17, correct immune primied rabbits to immune-primed rabbits.</p> <p>Discussion and Conclusions:</p> <p>Page 5, Line 6, correct theoritical to theoretical.</p> <p>Page 6, Line 3, correct delaye allergenic immune conversions to delayed allergenic immune conversions.</p> <p>Page 6, Line 15, correct on approvial to upon approval.</p> <p>Page 6, Line 14, correct immunogens inducing humoral hemagglutinin and precipitin responses to immunogens that induce humoral hemagglutinin and precipitin responses.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>All done</p> <p>All done</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

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>	