

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3777
Title of the Manuscript:	Microbiome - an omitted thread in the COVID-19 discussion
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses an often-overlooked aspect of the COVID-19 pandemic by focusing on the human microbiome and its critical role in immune system function and viral interactions. It integrates insights from diverse disciplines, including microbiology, virology, and ethnotoxicology, to present a comprehensive perspective on how industrialization and environmental disruption contribute to pandemics. While the manuscript is thought-provoking and sheds light on underexplored mechanisms, such as the virome's role and biofilm in COVID-19 susceptibility, its heavy reliance on speculative hypotheses and a lack of robust experimental evidence may limit its immediate impact. Overall, it serves as an important conceptual framework that can inspire further research in microbiome-immune interactions in the context of emerging infectious diseases.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Microbiome – An Omitted Thread in the COVID-19 Discussion," is somewhat suitable as it highlights the central focus of the manuscript: the microbiome's overlooked role in COVID-19. However, it could benefit from a more precise and engaging phrasing to better reflect the content and attract a broader scientific audience. Suggested Alternative Title: "The Role of the Microbiome in COVID-19: An Overlooked Perspective on Immune Interactions and Environmental Impacts" This alternative maintains the core idea while emphasizing the manuscript's exploration of immune mechanisms and environmental factors influencing the pandemic.	
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 conceptual overview of the manuscript but lacks clarity and focus on key findings, methodologies, or specific implications. It delves into philosophical and evolutionary perspectives, which may detract from the scientific focus. Additionally, it fails to highlight the critical arguments or findings related to the microbiome's role in COVID-19. Suggested Revision: This study explores the critical but underexplored role of the human microbiome in the COVID-19 pandemic. It hypothesizes that disruptions in microbiome-immune interactions, exacerbated by environmental and industrial factors, contribute to pandemic susceptibility. The manuscript highlights the interplay between endogenous viruses, gut microbiota, and immune homeostasis while emphasizing the need for holistic research into microbiome-related therapeutic strategies. These findings underscore the importance of considering microbiome dynamics in addressing emerging infectious diseases.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript's structure, while ambitious and interdisciplinary, could benefit from clearer organization and subsection refinement to enhance readability and coherence. Currently, it transitions between concepts such as evolutionary biology, microbiome-immune interactions, and environmental impacts without a consistently logical flow. Strengths: 1. Approach is Multidisciplinary the inclusion of diverse perspectives (e.g., microbiology, ethnotoxicology, and virology) enriches the discussion.	

[Review Form2](#)

	<p>2. Important concepts like the virome, microbiome, and environmental factors are addressed comprehensively. But it requires some improvements so the Suggestions for Improvement:</p> <p>Reorganize content into clear, distinct sections with logical progression. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contextualize the COVID-19 pandemic and introduce the microbiome focus. 2. Discuss the microbiome's role in health and disease, particularly in viral infections. 3. Analyze how human activity affects the microbiome and immunity. 4. Suggest actionable insights and potential therapeutic strategies. <p>Some sections are overly long and could be split for better focus. For instance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Separate discussions on endogenous viruses and environmental toxins for clarity. 2. Introduce a dedicated section on the "Human Virome" to emphasize its role in immunity. <p>Some ideas, such as microbiome disruption and environmental impacts, appear multiple times without adding new insights. Consolidating these discussions will streamline the manuscript. Adopting these structural changes would enhance clarity, ensure logical flow, and improve the manuscript's overall impact.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript explores an innovative and underexplored hypothesis about the microbiome's role in COVID-19, supported by references to relevant literature and established concepts in virology, immunology, and microbiology. It correctly emphasizes the microbiome's dynamic influence on immunity and how disruptions from industrialization may have implications for emerging infectious diseases. However, the manuscript relies heavily on conceptual frameworks and lacks empirical data or detailed methodological insights, which limits its ability to definitively support its claims. Despite this limitation, it provides a scientifically sound foundation for future experimental research, making it a thought-provoking contribution to the field.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>The manuscript includes a substantial number of references, many of which are relevant and foundational to the topics discussed, such as microbiome-immune interactions and environmental impacts on human health. However, several references are outdated, with some foundational studies predating the pandemic. This may limit the relevance of the manuscript in addressing the latest findings related to COVID-19 and microbiome research. A greater focus on recent studies, particularly post-2020, would enhance its scientific rigor.</p>	

Review Form2

<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 manuscript, while generally adequate for scholarly communication, could benefit from significant refinement to enhance clarity, precision, and readability. Currently, the text is dense, with frequent use of overly complex sentences and philosophical language that may detract from its scientific focus. Additionally, there are instances of repetition and verbosity that could be streamlined to improve the manuscript's overall quality.</p> <p>Areas of Improvement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Break down long sentences into shorter, more concise statements to enhance readability. Example: Replace "The components of our body are constantly exchanged within the shells of our body, becoming part of the integrally related living organisms..." with "The body's components are continuously exchanged, integrating with other organisms in the surrounding environment." 2. Avoid restating the same ideas in different sections, which can dilute the impact of key messages. 3. Replace vague or overly philosophical statements with clear, evidence-based arguments. Example: Replace "Thinking is not only a human privilege. All living matter thinks." with a scientifically grounded statement about cellular communication or biochemical signaling. 4. Address minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing to ensure the text adheres to standard scholarly English. <p>Implementing these changes will make the manuscript more accessible to its intended audience and better suited for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Syda Zille Huma Naqvi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>University of Agriculture, Pakistan</p>