



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_20138
Title of the Manuscript:	Pulmonary Paragonimiasis and Aspergillosis in Patients Suspected of Tuberculosis in Yaounde, Cameroon
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Title-needs to be modified as it conveys coinfection of all three organisms as key feature Line 61-duration of cough needs to be specified and WHO definition for tuberculosis suspicion shd.be followed 106—Filamentous test Why and for what using which sample?need to elaborate with reference 163-how was histoplasma identified from sputum sample?what stain.was some hitopathology staining performed?if so ,what was sample? 199 basis for speciation of paragonymus with morphological details of ova and reference for same need to be added	Can't think of a better way to present the topic. Done. This was mistake. It was supposed to be the germ tube test for isolation of <i>Candida albicans</i>. It has been corrected in the manuscript. Have been addressed in the discussion. See line 224. Have been addressed in the methods. See line 95.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		