

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_88731
Title of the Manuscript:	MOLECULAR TYPING OF DERMATOPHYTES ISOLATED FROM PUPILS AND STAFF MEMBERS OF SOME SELECTED SCHOOLS IN ANAMBRA STATE, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original 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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract: Mention the proper methodology in brief, it looks like sequencing was done directly using the sample. Mention fungal culture, identification. PCR and sequencing then phylogenetic tree. Methodology: Heading "Culture of sample" but you have not mention fungal culture, straight away "subjected to molecular typing" has been written. You need to write the methodology step by step. Sampling, Fungal culture, PCR then sequencing. Methodology: Primers used in the PCR has not been mentioned in the PCR protocol Results: It can be written in a systematic way, first write down the total number of culture positive sample along with the details (with the help of a table- specify the site of sampling, details of the study subject, type of fungi isolated). Then write the results for PCR and then sequencing and phylogenetic tree of the 12 fungal isolates Discussion: While comparing results with other authors' findings use scientific writing method. Example: This agrees with the work of (13)" is scientifically wrong. This type of writing style in the discussion needs to be modified. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Abstract and methodology: Age range of the study participants has to be corrected: 1 to 60 years cannot be the age range because minimum age of the students or pupils or children included in the study cannot be 1 year old Methodology: Study design has not been mentioned, instead sampling type has been written. Study design has to be written as cross-sectional study. 	
Optional/General comments	Introduction could be shorten while discussion could have been written more elaborately with more references	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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:	Leimapokpam Sumitra Devi
Department, University & Country	SGT Medical College Hospital and Research Institute, India