

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Pathogen Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJPR_108255</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Gonorrhoeae Must Compete With The Naturally Inhabitant of Microbial Community Right At The Outer Mucosal Surface To Authorize Infection</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Review Article</b>

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. The work presented is of importance in the field of medicine/public health; However, you must take care of the form, style, and syntax and give order and coherence to what you intend to communicate, in addition to avoiding repeating information.</p> <p>2. The title of the work seems appropriate.</p> <p>3. It is suggested to improve the writing of the summary, taking care of the order of each "section" and the ideas. It's not exactly a discussion - in a summary</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure are well marked, just take care of the style.</p> <p>5. The work is susceptible to improvement both in substance and in the way it is written.</p> <p>6. The references seem to be sufficient; However, they must be written taking care of the style/form (according to the guidelines suggested by the journal), both in each of the paragraphs they support, and at the end of the list of references.</p> <p>Review the wording of the information, errors and conditions are marked (colored) in the document that the authors must review, analyze and make the corresponding changes; There are paragraphs without bibliographic reference.</p> <p>Review the conclusions, give them order, coherence and be concise, considering which ones really emanate from the manuscript.</p> <p>Review and correct the information corresponding to the marked references (take care of the style and data - only what is necessary).</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>A minor revision is required regarding the writing of English. The document presents some writing details (order, syntax, style) on which it is suggested to review and work</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Necessary suggestions to carry out Reference to a journal: 1. Hilly M, Adams ML, Nelson SC. A study of digit fusion in the mouse embryo. Clin Exp Allergy. 2002;32(4):489-98. Reference to a book: 2. Rang HP, Dale MM, Ritter JM, Moore PK. Pharmacology. 5th ed. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone; 2003. Reference to Web-resource or Electronic articles. 3. Hugo JT, Mondal SC. Parallels between tissue repair and embryo morphogenesis: a conceptual framework. Global Health. 2006;16:4. Accessed 29 March 2012. Available: <a href="http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14">http://www.globalizationandhealth.com/content/1/1/14</a>.</p> <p>It is important to consider the guidelines of writing - editing that gives the journal, and as an example the following conditions can be applied at work: This predominance of <i>A. lumbricoides</i> than any other GIPs agreed with some other reports [23,15]. On the other hand, da Silva et al. [19], Khanal et al. [2] and Hernández et al. [25] found <i>T. trichiura</i> predominant</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Benjamin Valladares Carranza</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Autonomous University of the State of Mexico, Mexico</b>