

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_111856
Title of the Manuscript:	Studying the blood virtues of animals spontaneously infected with <i>Microsporum</i> spp. and the scheme in the treatment of the fungal disease <i>Microsporum</i> spp.
Type of the Article	

Review Form 1.7

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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p> <p>No</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Comments</p> <p>Line 106 : To present the photos, you should give the title and source of the photo. This should be corrected throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Line 132-134 : How can identification at species level be confirmed simply by observing the smear under the microscope? I'm not convinced that this is possible, as the identification of colonies after culture is not done through microscopic observation. You need to review this part. How did you know that the cause of these skin lesions is <i>M. Canis</i> ?</p> <p>Line 159-161 : I can not understand what you are talking about « The apparent Prevalence and True Prevalence » . I think that if you have collected your samples properly, with good identification of your colonies, the prevalences obtained should be true.</p> <p>Another thing: how do you go from apparent prevalence to true prevalence?</p> <p>Line 163-172 : This paragraph simply presents the results, but does not discuss them.</p> <p>Line 174-182 : This paragraph simply presents the results, but does not discuss them.</p> <p>Line 184-190 : This paragraph simply presents the results, but does not discuss them. What makes this treatment so special? Is it effective? If so, why? If not, why not?</p> <p>Line 191 : The conclusion does not correspond to the work carried out. The work was based solely on samples of dogs and cats, but the conclusion refers to children, why? I think the conclusion should be redrafted to reflect the work carried out.</p> <p>Line 215-272 : Not all the references are well presented. The author of the manuscript has not followed the journal's instructions (cf : Submissions Annual Research & Review in Biology (journalarrb.com)). All references should be revised.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mbehang Nguema Pierre Philippe
Department, University & Country	Institut de Recherche en Ecologie Tropicale, Gabon