



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_53198
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Identification of Dermatophytes and their Antifungal Susceptibility to Ketoconazole, Fluconazole, Clotrimazole, Miconazole and Terbinafine by Agar Diffusion Neo-Sensitabs Method
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is quite interesting and scientifically robust. The authors should revise the paper following my comments and suggestions:</p> <p>Suggested manuscript title: Isolation, Identification and Antifungal susceptibility of Dermatophytes isolated from clinically suspected cases of Tinea infections in Pakistan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All abbreviations should be introduced first before using. 2. Check for typographical and grammatical errors all through the manuscript. 3. Check and remove all unnecessary statements. 4. All scientific nomenclature should be in italics. 5. Keywords: Add these words; Susceptibility, <i>Tinea</i> species, Pakistan. 6. Introduction: Too much paragraphing here and unnecessary statements. The authors should state the problem and rationale of the study. The introduction should end with the objectives of the study. Always use recent literatures in your work. 7. Materials and Methods: There should be sub-heading just after the Materials and Methods heading. State the kind of sample collected from the patients in your abstract and methodology. Did you use an atlas map to identify fungal species isolated? If yes, state the source of the map. Also use advance methods as confirmatory to the fungal isolates isolated. No ethical clearance obtained for the study which is not acceptable because it involves human subjects and consent of the participants taken was not stated in anywhere. Please make justice to that and show ethical clearance reference number. 8. Results: Why showing picture of only <i>T. mentagrophytes</i>? What is special about it? Please show pictures of all species isolated or expunge from your work. No results tables in your work (cultural, morphological, percentage occurrences, susceptibility table etc). Start new statement in words and not in Roman numeral (See 3. Results heading). 9. Discuss your results sequentially as stated in the result section and relate to similar and recent studies done elsewhere. Always give reason for each outcome. 10. Conclude with your striking findings (Isolated organisms and their identity are absent in your conclusion). 11. Add more recent references to your study. 12. What are the limitations of this study and way forward? 	
Minor REVISION comments		
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)	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Victor Baba Oti</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Nasarawa State University, Nigeria</i>