SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**British Microbiology Research Journal**
Manuscript Number:	**2015_BMRJ_17225**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Sequences variations of Human Papillomavirus type 16 E6 and E7 genes in cervical cancer isolates from Gabon**
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	Subject under study: Important, novel epidemiological, HPV 16 genetic study of cervical cancer patients in Gabon. The scientific method is sound, interpretation & discussion are fine. However, proper English language editing is required throughout the manuscript (see below). Overall quality of manuscript: suboptimal. Recommend a scientific writer to review and edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure and word choice.	We thank the reviewer for his comment and improved the english quality
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	ABSTRACT OF MANUSCRIPT (SUMMARIZED BY REVIEWER) 1. **Objective**: Determine sequence variations of HPV 16 E6, E7 in cervical cancer isolates from Gabon. 2. **Design**: Cross-sectional. Comparison of HPV E6, E7 sequences found in CX CA cases from Gabon versus previously reported HPV16 sequences. 3. **Data collection**: DNA sequencing 4. **Data analysis**: Phylogenetic tree analysis using	

	Maximum Likelihood with MEGA 6 package. 5. **Data interpretation**: sound interpretation of results Overall quality of manuscript: Scientific method is sound; however, manuscript is suboptimal due to improper English language.	