

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Biology &amp; Biotechnology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_130208
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative Efficacy of deuterium (D2O) and Alum as an adjuvant in shelf life of HS vaccine.
Type of the Article	Research 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>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript addresses a critical challenge in vaccine development: improving the thermostability of vaccines to overcome cold chain dependencies, particularly in resource-limited settings. By comparing deuterium (D2O) and alum as adjuvants, the study explores novel approaches to extending vaccine shelf life at elevated temperatures. The findings have the potential to contribute significantly to global efforts in ensuring vaccine stability and accessibility.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title is suitable but could be rephrased for clarity. I suggest: Comparative Analysis of Deuterium (D2O) and Alum Adjuvants in Enhancing the Shelf Life of the haemorrhagic septicaemia Vaccine.	
<b>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.</b>	The abstract provides a general overview but lacks sufficient detail on methodology and results. I suggest to add the quantitative data on antibody titres; statistical outcomes and refine the language for clarity.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically sound overall but has the following shortcomings: - Lack of detail in the Materials and Methods section, particularly regarding the I-ELISA protocol and vaccine preparation. - Absence of ethical approval information for animal use. - Insufficient analysis of results and their practical implications in the Discussion section.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	No, the manuscript requires significant language editing for grammatical correctness, conciseness, and clarity.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript demonstrates strong scientific potential, but it requires substantial revisions in methodology detail and discussion depth.  Also, figures and tables should have more descriptive captions for better interpretation.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Akakpo Oluwole Koam Theophile Christophert</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>National Institute of Animal Biotechnology, India</b>