

[Review Form 2](#)

Book Name:	HUMAN LABORATORY IMMUNOLOGY
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3575
Title of the Manuscript:	HUMAN LABORATORY IMMUNOLOGY
Type of the Article	Complete Book

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it provides detailed and practical methodologies for the preparation and standardization of microbial antigens, essential for serological studies and vaccine development. The clarity and systematic approach enhance its usability for researchers in immunology and microbiology. I appreciate its focus on practical applications, though a deeper discussion on the broader implications of these methods would further enrich its value. Overall, it serves as a useful reference for advancing diagnostic and immunological tools.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No,, Suggested e Title: "Standardization of Microbial Antigens: Methods for Diagnostic and Vaccine Applications" This revised title emphasizes the practical and impactful aspects of the work while maintaining clarity and scientific relevance.	
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 somewhat comprehensive but could be improved by including specific details about the prepared antigens, their applications, and the key methodologies used. It would benefit from a concise mention of the study's practical implications, such as its relevance to diagnostic tools and vaccine development, while removing redundant phrases to enhance clarity and impact.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's subsections are appropriate and follow a logical flow. However, some sections, like counting methods, need clearer organization, and the "Immunodiagnostic Tips" could be merged with the conclusion for better coherence.	
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 manuscript demonstrates scientific accuracy by providing detailed and standardized protocols for antigen preparation, supported by well-established methodologies in immunology and microbiology. The procedures for preparing whole erythrocyte, E. coli, and S. typhi antigens align with widely recognized techniques, ensuring reproducibility and precision. Additionally, the use of antigen counting methods such as spectrophotometry and opacity tubes further strengthens the technical rigor of the study. Overall, the manuscript reflects a deep understanding of immunodiagnostic processes and antigen preparation, ensuring scientific robustness and potential applications in disease diagnosis and vaccine development.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the manuscript are somewhat limited and may not reflect the most recent advancements in the field. I suggest including more recent studies, particularly those from the last 5-10 years, on antigen preparation, serodiagnosis, and vaccine development to enhance the manuscript's scientific context.	

[Review Form 2](#)

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language quality of the article is generally clear but could benefit from minor revisions to enhance readability and precision. Some sentences are overly complex, and there are occasional grammatical inconsistencies. A careful review to ensure proper sentence structure, grammar, and clarity would improve the overall quality. Minor adjustments in terminology and consistency will help make the manuscript more suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript provides valuable insights into the preparation and standardization of various microbial antigens, which are crucial for diagnostics and vaccine development. However, the article could benefit from more detailed discussions on the practical applications of these antigen preparations in current research and clinical settings. Additionally, expanding the introduction to include more background on the role of antigens in immune response would provide better context for the reader. A brief mention of the limitations of the methods used or potential challenges in antigen standardization would also add depth to the discussion. Overall, the manuscript is informative but could be improved by addressing these aspects for a more comprehensive presentation.</p> <p>While there are some strong aspects, there are notable issues (such as language quality, structure, or other areas requiring substantial revision) that would need to be addressed before the manuscript could be considered for publication.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Omar Sadik Shalal</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Middle Technical Unicersity, Iraq</p>