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| PART 1: Comments |
|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript focuses on microbial immunology by discussing the basics and the latest information on probiotics and new infections. It helps students, teachers and researchers gain research knowledge. The expertise it provides to basic and applied immunology is why it matters to the scientific community. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | The present title, "MICROBIAL IMMUNOLOGY," gives a good sense of the main areas discussed in the manuscript. |  |
| 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. | There is no formal summary of the manuscript which should explain both its contents and importance. Creating an abstract for your article would make it much simpler for readers to follow along. The introduction should note that the book aims to fully explain microbial immunology, includes two sections—basic and applied—and covers matters such as natural and adaptive immunity, microbial pathogenesis, emerging infections and the link between the microbiome and the immune system. The intended audience of the abstract covers students, researchers and workers in laboratory and clinical immunology. Adding this section will make the manuscript both more academic and interesting to readers. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | The findings are scientifically pertinent, even though the content needs to be polished for greater clarity. Some things explained in the book are no longer relevant or are not clear enough and the terms sometimes change. Areas like immune mechanisms and interactions between microbiome and the body should be brought up to date with the help of recent studies. Yet, the information is worth reading despite the need for a thorough scientific review to fit academic quality. |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.** | At present, the manuscript fails to include the important citations and references that are essential for its scientific value. Key ideas in trained immunity, microbiome interactions and emerging infectious diseases are best discussed with references. For better academic quality, make sure to include current peer-reviewed sources all through the text. The use of new references both proves the accuracy of your content and helps readers learn more on the subject. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Sadly, scholarly communication cannot currently rely on the English of this article. There are many grammatical mistakes, poor phrasing, shifts in the way terms are used and unusual expressions in the manuscript which can make the message less professional. It is necessary to do substantial language editing for a publication to reach academic standards. |  |
| Optional/General comments | The manuscript presents a broad and relevant overview of microbial immunology with a clear structure and comprehensive content. It has strong academic potential and could serve as a valuable resource for students and researchers. However, the current language quality significantly affects readability. The text contains frequent grammatical errors, awkward phrasing, and inconsistent terminology, which detract from its clarity and scholarly tone. A thorough language and editorial review is necessary to bring the manuscript up to academic publishing standards. With proper revision, the work could be a useful and informative contribution to the field. |  |
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| **PART 2:**  |
|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment *(if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?**  |  |  |
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