

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_103139
Title of the Manuscript:	Post renal transplant fungal infections of lung- series of 3 case reports.
Type of the Article	Case report

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://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory 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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1.This article adds to the scholarships on how to improve the outcomes of renal transplants in an important way.</p> <p>2.It can be improved as: Case Series on Post renal transplant fungal infections of the lung.</p> <p>3.The abstract should clearly indicate the aims and objectives of the study, methodology, results/findings and the recommendations.</p> <p>4. The discussion section should focus on the three main fungal infections identified in the 3 cases reviewed. The management of the patients, investigations and other patient-related factors should be compared with existing literature. Other fungal infections can be included in sub-section 'Literature Review' under Introduction. A section on ethical considerations should be included to address how issues of patient confidentiality, data protection and other ethical requirements such as ethical approval for the study were addressed.</p> <p>The conclusion is unwieldy as it is because it raises various new topics that were not part of the original aims and objectives of the study. Consider making this section lucid; our study found that.....Therefore we recommend that.....Future studies should consider.....</p> <p>5. The study is scientifically relevant and the language used is scholarly.</p> <p>6. The references are sufficient.</p> <p>7. The document should be edited extensively for both grammars, typesetting and other quality issues. I suggest using softwares such as Grammarly.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The document should be edited extensively for both grammars, typesetting and other quality issues. I suggest using softwares such as Grammarly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oluremilekun Kusimo
Department, University & Country	University of Saskatchewan, Canada