



GPH Review Form

Journal Name:	BIONATURE
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BN_1619
Title of the Manuscript:	Malaria vaccines targeting Pfs25 antigen in parasite mosquito stages to block transmission
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://globalpresshub.com/index.php/BN/editorial-policy>)

[GPH Review Form](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>This is a very interesting review article on the use of the Pfs25 protein as an antigen as a strategy to block the transmission of malaria.</p> <p>The review article is important for the scientific community as it offers an overview of the subject. The title is appropriate, as is the abstract, which is comprehensive. The sections of the manuscript are correct and the article seemed scientifically correct to me. I only have one criticism, regarding the references. They are in sufficient numbers, but they are not recent.</p>	<p>Thank you for your time to review our article. All valuable comments and suggestions from you and other reviewers have helped us to improve our manuscript. We have made revisions accordingly and highlighted them in yellow.</p>
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Although there are some spelling mistakes, the manuscript is well written</p>	<p>We have re-checked the spelling and made sure no mistakes</p>
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>My biggest criticism is regarding the references, which are a bit old.</p>	<p>We have added several newer references in the article, including newer data from WHO. Studies on Pfs25 based vaccines are not progressed much in recent years, hence several references used in this article may seems a bit old.</p>

[GPH Review Form](#)

PART 2:

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