

Review of: "[Review] Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde: From Two Branches of Immune Response to Three Types of Interferon Response"

Rakesh Singh¹

¹ Banaras Hindu University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In this review article the authors attempt to highlight the significance of interferons, along with their types and signalling mechanism in detail. The authors have covered most of the aspects pertaining to the topic in detail, however, some minor corrections need to be addressed.

1. The introduction section needs a lot more referencing. Many of the important sentences lack citations.
2. The whole article should be rechecked for references. Some of the references cited seem to be missing the context of the sentences.
3. The complete article should be reviewed and edited for English language by the help of some expert. The article does not follow the syntax at many places. Some of the phrases are either too long or too short, lacking appropriate communication of the information. Properly constructed comprehensible statements needs to be considered for the article. Grammatical errors should be avoided.
4. In section 3.1 the symbols for amino acids are incorrect. Lysine should be (K) followed by alanine (A).
5. The use of the word "unknown" at multiple places seems odd. Try replacing it wherever required for better understanding of the readers.
6. The legend of figure 1 highlights the significance of "electrostatic potential" during binding. However, the figure seems to be missing the indication. The figure does not explain the difference in "electrostatic potential" during these binding events. The data should be added in the figure.
7. Once the abbreviations (acronyms) are indicated at an initial stage, the authors should refrain themselves from using the whole phrase/word again in the article, and should continue with the acronyms only.
8. In section 3.3 "During 1990s.....Various laboratories were known when four scientists.....molecular basis". Both these sentences are not properly framed and are extremely confusing. Please recheck the entire manuscript for properly framed statements/phrases.
9. What is "AI" disorders? The authors have not mentioned it in the entire manuscript. Please explain.

10. Figure 2 needs correction. The figure is very confusing and unintelligible. It mentions the role of proteins like p28, & p65, but it is mentioned nowhere in the manuscript. The pattern recognition receptors are not indicated anywhere in the figure. What does the following bullet points in the figure indicates? 1. Antifungal 2. Anti-bacterial 3. Anti-viral. It seems irrelevant to the image. The entire image should be reconstructed.

11. In figure 5. What does the human anatomical structure represent? It is unclear due to the poor quality of the image.