

[Review Form 2](#)

|                          |                                    |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Book Name:               | <b>HUMAN LABORATORY IMMUNOLOGY</b> |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_BPR_3575</b>                 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>HUMAN LABORATORY IMMUNOLOGY</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Complete Book</b>               |

**PART 1: Review Comments**

| <b>Compulsory</b> 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> |
|--|---|---|
| <b>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.</b>                        | <b>This manuscript is a valuable resource for the scientific community, particularly for future students of immunology. It offers a comprehensive and well-structured overview, covering nearly all the essential chapters of the field. The detailed description of protocols and the inclusion of relatively recent references enhance its relevance and practical application. However, while the content is highly informative, the language and grammar need refinement. I suggest having the manuscript reviewed by a native English speaker to improve its readability and clarity before publication.</b>   |   |
| <b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>  | <b>The title "Human Laboratory Immunology" is concise, but it could be more descriptive to convey the manuscript's broad content and focus. A more specific alternative title could be:<br/><br/>"Comprehensive Approaches in Human Laboratory Immunology: Protocols, Principles, and Applications"</b>   |   |
| <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>   | <b>The abstract is clear, with well-defined key objectives and an overview of the methods, but it lacks proper language and clarity in expression.</b>  |   |
| <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  | <b>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate, as they are logically organized and facilitate a clear understanding of the content.</b>   |   |
| <b>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.</b> | <b>This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound, as it provides a comprehensive overview of human laboratory immunology, covering essential concepts and protocols. The detailed descriptions of immunization protocols, serodiagnosis, and antigen preparation are grounded in established immunological principles, ensuring the accuracy and relevance of the content. The inclusion of recent references further supports the manuscript's scientific credibility, reflecting current trends and advancements in the field. Overall, the manuscript demonstrates a solid understanding of immunology and provides valuable insights for both students and researchers.</b>                         |   |
| <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.<br/>=</b>   | <b>The references in the manuscript appear to be sufficient and relatively recent, supporting the content with up-to-date information on immunology and related protocols. However, to ensure the manuscript remains relevant and reflective of the most current advancements in the field, I would recommend reviewing the references for any key publications from the past 2–3 years that might be missing. If there are significant developments in immunology, immunodiagnosis, or vaccine research, they should be included to further strengthen the manuscript. Adding references from high-impact journals or recent reviews could also enhance the depth and breadth of the manuscript's scientific foundation.</b> |   |

[Review Form 2](#)

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Minor REVISION comments<br><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b> | The language and English quality of the article can be improved to meet the standards of scholarly communication. While the content is valuable and well-structured, refining the language for clarity, grammar, and fluency would enhance its readability and professionalism. A thorough review by a native English speaker or an editor would help ensure that the manuscript aligns with academic writing conventions and improves its overall impact. |  |
| Optional/General comments   | <b>While the content is scientifically robust and comprehensive, the language and grammar need significant improvement. The manuscript is well-organized, with detailed protocols and relevant references, but a thorough review of the language and clarity is required for it to meet the standards of scholarly communication. With these revisions, the manuscript could be suitable for publication.</b>  |  |

**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) |
| <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>Slavica Hristomanova Mitkovska</b>              |
| Department, University & Country | <b>MIT University, Republic of North Macedonia</b> |