



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_41329
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Vigna subterranea seed extract as possible adjuvant for Typhoid fever vaccine
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The authors should provide the analysis and interpretation of the results rather than just displaying the tables. Why did the authors choose to prepare the vaccines themselves rather than use the standard available preparation? From my own opinion the later (less subject to variability) would have given more objective interpretation of the outcome?	We have properly addressed that. We actually followed reproducible protocol. It is more reliable for us due to cold-chain cahlleng for the conventional vaccine.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		