



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	After reading this manuscript, I considered that is adequate for the journal. However revision is necessary. After of analysis of primers, I observed that TM (melting temperature) is not correct for E6 primers. Maybe it is an equivocation of authors. According to my analysis of TM for forward primers is of 46.11° C while for reverse primer is of 47.92° C. Why the authors used TM in 49.5° C?. Garbuglia et al., (15) was the reference that was cited by authors, for use these primers. However, Garbuglia described a TM of 58° C. Another observation was that Garbuglia's primers have a deficiency because only 10 from 14 nucleotides of E6 forward primer was identified by the sequence complementary of the target region according with LC027225.1 sequence analysed and it is reported in GenBank. Another aspect was I can't analyse the regions sequenced by authors because GenBank accession numbers were not available. These are critical aspects because I can't observe the mutation point described by the authors	Tm depends on various factors like Mg+ and other buffer used. It can explain why our tm is different to the tm of Garbuglia et al., In fact during our work we tried several annealing temperature around the calculated annealing temperature and 49.5°C gave us a good results. This comment is correct. In our work, we have not sequenced the two strands of the E6 gene, we only sequenced with the E6 Foward primer because the mutation are between nt104 and 559 and if we used the reverse primer it will be difficult for us to identified the mutation at the end of the sequence. The sequencing doesn't read correctly at the end of a sequence. We added this in the material and methods section see line 68 The sequences are not available in the GenBank database for the moment. The sequences have been submitted in January and we received the accession number the 21 January. However during the submission, we have not requested a specific release for our sequence. The Genbank team send us a mail and specified that our record will be released to the public database once they are processed and we can submit our



SDI Review Form 1.6

		manuscript before our accessions are released in GenBank.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	A revision of the references is necessary. I consider that some are outdated references and that are not necessary. Furthermore, some are not well written, for example: the reference 11, lack an author, the name of the journal is not complete and lack of volume number.	We check the reference as suggested by the reviewer.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		