

Review Form2

Book Name:	Disease and Health Research: New Insights
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2300
Title of the Manuscript:	A BRIEF OVERVIEW ON PHARMACOLOGICAL TREATMENT & DIAGNOSIS OF FUNGAL INFECTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses an emerging and intriguing area of research that links fungal infections with Alzheimer's Disease (AD). The topic is significant as it opens new avenues for understanding the pathogenesis of AD and exploring potential therapeutic interventions. However, the manuscript would benefit from more rigorous scientific support and clarity in its arguments. While the concept is promising, the execution requires refinement to ensure that it contributes meaningfully to the field.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It is appropriate	
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 is not comprehensive enough and lacks clarity. It needs to provide a more structured summary of the key points discussed in the chapter, including both the association between fungal infections and AD and the specific pharmacological treatments. Additionally, the grammar and syntax need revision for better readability.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections are generally appropriate but could be better organized. The manuscript would benefit from a clearer distinction between the discussion of different fungal species and their specific relevance to AD. Additionally, a dedicated section on the challenges and limitations of current diagnostic methods would enhance the structure.	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript presents a scientifically robust concept by exploring the potential link between fungal infections and AD. However, the scientific arguments need to be better substantiated with evidence from recent and relevant studies. The discussion on the mechanisms by which fungal infections may contribute to AD is particularly underdeveloped and requires more detailed exploration. Overall, while the manuscript is technically sound, it requires significant revisions to strengthen its scientific foundation.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are somewhat sufficient but could be updated to include more recent studies, particularly those published in the last five years. The manuscript would benefit from a broader range of citations to support its claims, especially in the discussion of the mechanisms of fungal involvement in AD.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality of the manuscript needs improvement. There are several grammatical errors, awkward sentence structures, and unclear expressions that hinder the readability of the chapter. A thorough review and editing for English language and style are necessary to meet scholarly communication standards.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fredrick Mutisya
Department, University & Country	Moi University, Kenya